CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF

ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION

Vol. I

BY

S. KHUDA BUKHSH, M.A., B.C.L.,

BARRISTER-AT-LAW

THIRD EDITION



UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

1959

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF

ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION

Vol. I

BY

S. KHUDA BUKHSH, M.A., B.C.L.,

BARRISTER-AT-LAW

THIRD EDITION





UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

1959

Rs. 8.00

PRINTED IN INDIA

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY SIBENDRANATH KANJILAL,
SUPERINTENDENT, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS,
48, HAZRA ROAD, BALLYGUNGE, CALCUTTA.

1903B—January, 1959—A

To

A lover of learning

and a writer of growing renown

Mr. Wajid Ali

I dedicate these volumes

in commemoration of a friendship

which has stood the test of time.

FOREWORD TO THE SECOND EDITION

The second edition of my ' Contributions to the History of Islamic Civilization ' which I now offer to the public is not merely a reprint of the first but contains a great deal of new matter. In fact the second volume is entirely new. It consists of original papers and translations from German. The one thread which unites them is the history of Islamic Civilization. They deal with the various phases of that civilization and are held together by that one uniting bond.

I need hardly add anything more. I, here, offer my thanks to Mr. Marmaduke Picthall for permitting me to incorporate two papers that appeared in the first instance in his Quarterly, and to Mr. J. A. Chapman and my wife for looking through the proofs.

22, Royd Street,
Calcutta.
1929

S. Khuda Bukhsh.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I now offer to the public an English translation of Von Kremer's *Culturgeschichtliche Streifzüge auf dem Gebiete des Islam.* The monograph lying before us contains the rarest and choicest product of Von Kremer's historical studies. Sound, erudite, interesting and above all suggestive, it stands almost unique both as regards its fine scholarship and its wide comprehensiveness. The main theme of Von Kremer is the influence of Judaism and Christianity, Parseeism and Manichæism on Islam; but it is a work of genuine scholarship and not of rancorous controversy. It is, as we might expect, singularly free from *parti pris*, prejudice and passion. Von Kremer is the interpreter of history and not the advocate of a party. It is the pursuit of truth that has called into being the present as well as the other works of that great orientalist. Nor has he confined his attention to merely religious questions, but has also discussed, with equal luminousness, the social problems which vexed the heart and entangled the feet of many generations of Muslims.

Nearly fifty years have rolled away since this monograph saw the light, but in spite of ceaseless activity in all branches of oriental learning it even now stands all but unrivalled.

The reader will find here not merely the history of the origin and growth of the Islamic sects, but will also see sketched before him the social life of the early as well as of the later Muslims. He will be able to follow,

step by step, the changes which came over the sons of the desert; the gradual but appreciable departures from the old, stern and unbending habits and mode of life, the slow and silent transformation effected under the influence of Persian and Byzantine luxury and license, the steady decline of the ideals of purity, equality, and fraternity of the early Muslims, the rise of a system of government which may be aptly described as a tax-hoarding monarchy, heedless of the welfare of its subjects, and riding roughshod over their feelings, and finally the beginning and the growth of the anti-Arab or the Shu'ūbiyyah movement, which eventually succeeded in destroying the Arab rule and the Arab Government. In the following introduction the writer does not lay claim to any originality. The facts and conclusions therein are derived from the works of such great pioneers in oriental scholarship as Goldziher, Wellhausen, Browne and others. What the writer can fairly claim is to have made some of the most valuable researches of these scholars accessible to those who know no German and to have brought together a number of facts in regard to the early social history of Islam. Having said so much by way of explanation, the writer has not felt it incumbent upon himself to indicate in every instance the exact source of his remarks.

Von Kremer's masterly treatment of the influence of Christianity on the origin and growth of the early sects of Islam leaves little to be added. But the present writer cannot pass by this subject without observing that Von Kremer, in his eagerness to show the influence of Christianity on Islam, has gone a trifle too far. It would be idle to deny the powerful influence of Christianity

on Islam, but at the same time it would be somewhat rash to contend that almost all the early sects of Islam owe their origin and existence to contemporary Christian thought and contemporary Christian philosophy. Let us take for instance the Mu'tazilah sect. The most recent researches place it beyond doubt that it arose quite independently of Christian philosophy, though the latter played an important rôle in its subsequent growth.[1] The origin of the Murji'ah, on the other

[1] Shahrastānī, Haarbrücker's tr., pp. 386 *et seq.*; Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten, p. 5; Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, pp. 281 *et seq.* For the convenience of the reader I here add the following notes about the Murji'ah and the Mu'tazilah sects :—

That the Murji'ah arose before the end of the first century of the Hegira is shown from a passage in Ibn Qutaibah's Kitābu-l-Ma'ārif (p. 129), where it is said that 'Utbah Ibn Mas'ūd [died in A.H. 98 (716—7 A.D.)] had a son who in his youth (*circa* 80—100 A.H.) accepted the doctrines of the Murji'ah, but later on renounced them. According to a passage in Zarqānī's Commentary of the Muwaṭṭa' (Vol. III, p. 24) Mohammed, the son of 'Alī, is said to have introduced the Murji'ah doctrines. He died in the year 81 A.H. (700 A.D.). According to Shahrastānī the first Murji' was Ḥasan, a grandson of 'Alī. That the Murji'ah were prior in order of time to the Mu'tazilah is shown from the passages in Shahrastānī (Vol. I, pp. 26-47). As regards the Mu'tazilah, as is well-known, Wāṣil, its founder, died in A.H. 131 (748—49 A.D.). He was a pupil of Ḥasan of Baṣrah (d. 110 A.H. =728—29 A.D.). See Von Kremer, Gesch. der herrsch. Ideen d. Islam, p. 125.

The golden period of the Mu'tazilah falls between 100 A.H.—225 A.H. (718—849 A.D.). The Caliph Hishām was an enemy of the Qadariyyah sect. Wellhausen, p. 217; Ṭabarī, 2nd Series, pp. 1733-1777; Browne, p. 283. The Caliph Yazīd ibnu-l-Walīd ibn 'Abdi-l-Malik followed the opinion of Ghailān ibn Muslim, whom Hishām killed for his Qadariyyah belief. De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, p. 130. Most of the people of Mizzah (Yāqūt, Vol. IV, p. 522), who secretly did homage to Yazīd ibnu-l-Walīd and rose against Al-Walīd ibn Yazīd or Walīd II followed the opinion of Ghailān ibn Muslim, or in other words, were Qadariyyah. De Goeje, p. 135.

Wāṣil (d. 131 A.H.), 'Allāf (d. 235 A.H.). Naḍḥān lived about 220 of the A.H. (835 A.D.). The Jahmiyyah, the followers of Jahm Ibn Ṣafwān, arose about 130 A.H. (747—8 A.D.). The Ḥabiṭiyyah about 220

hand, is to be sought in the necessity of establishing some *modus vivendi* with the Omayyad rule, and this view of their origin is strengthened and confirmed by the fact that, with the fall of the Omayyad dynasty,

A.H. (835 A.D.). The Jubba'iyyah about 303 A.H. (915 A.D.). The Bahshamiyyah, about 321 A.H. (933 A.D.). The bitterest persecution of the Mu'tazilah took place under the fanatical Caliph Al-Qādir in 408 A.H. (1917—18 A.D.), when they were required to renounce their doctrines and solemnly abjure them. Though the political power of the Mu'tazilites ceased soon after the accession of Al-Mutawakkil, the tenth 'Abbāsid Caliph (A.D. 847), the school was powerfully represented nearly three centuries later by Zamakhsharī, the great commentator of the Qur'ān (Browne, p. 289). They were obliged to subscribe to a written recantation. Those who refused to do so were subjected to most severe physical punishments. The same course was adopted by the Ghaznawid Sultan Maḥmūd Ibn Sabuktakīn, as regards the Mu'tazilah in the countries under him. But his persecutions were not confined to them; they were directed against all schismatics, whether Mu'tazilah, Shī'ites, Ismā'iliyyah, Karmathians, Jahmiyyah or Mushabbihah. They were killed, crucified or exiled ('Uyūnu-t-Tawarīkh). In the following year a pastoral mandate was read in the palace of the Caliph Al-Qādir, with great festivity, in which every one was declared an infidel who expressed the view of the Qur'ān being *created* as opposed to the orthodox belief which held the Qur'ān as '*uncreate*'. Al-Qādir was a fanatic, who even posed as a theological writer. He wrote a book in defence of the orthodox beliefs in which he especially attacked the Mu'tazilah. This book was publicly read and commented upon every Friday, in the mosque of Mahdī as long as Al-Qādir ruled, before the students studying tradition. In the year 420 A.H. the Caliph Al-Qādir caused all the Qāḍhīs and 'Ulama' to be summoned to the palace. A work, composed by the Caliph himself, in which he had put together the fundamental principles of orthodox belief, and had refuted the opinions of the Mu'tazilah and those similar to them, was read out to them. On the 20th Ramaḍhān they were again invited and the Caliph caused another work, also composed by him, to be read out to them. It contained notifications and exhortations to them to refute the heresy which asserted the Qur'ān as '*created*'. After it had been read out, the Caliph caused those present to subscribe their names to it. On the 12th Dhu-l-Qa'dah a third time they were summoned, and a document was read out to them to which they had to subscribe their names. The Caliph, moreover, removed all the Shī'ite Imāms from the mosques and appointed Sunnīs in their places. For further information see Professor Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia. See also Von Kremer's Gesch. d. herrsch. Ibeen, p. 127.

the Murji'ah, as an independent party, ceased to exist.[1] Before discussing the social and religious causes which contributed to the overthrow of the Arab rule, when we shall revert to this subject at length, we will briefly deal with other traces of Christian influence on Islam which though equally important have not found a place in Von Kremer's monograph.

That the later Islam was largely leavened by Christianity, no student of history will ever think of questioning or disputing; but it is singular that very early indeed in its career Islam commenced drawing upon Christian thoughts and sentiments. Apart from those Christian ideas which made their way into Islam through the monks and the half-educated converts, we find a whole mass of Christian ideas and phrases in Muslim books which reveal some, if not a comprehensive, knowledge of the contents of the Christian books. It will strike even a superficial observer of the life of Mohammed that in his biography, as it is written by his followers, the attempt is constantly made to draw a picture of Mohammed which may not yield to the Christian portrait of Jesus. Though Mohammed was never weary of impressing upon his followers the fact that he was a man of like passions unto them, he has, nevertheless, been invested with the power of working miracles and doing supernatural things. The miracle related in the Gospel of St. John, II, 1-11, has served as a model for a number of Mohammedan legends which were woven into the life of the prophet at a tolerably early period.[2]

[1] Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, Vol. II, p. 91.

[2] Throughout this Introduction I have followed Dr. Goldziher. See Vol. II, p. 382.

The Maghribite Qāḍhī 'Iyāḍh (5th century) has industriously collected a large number of these legends and, though the authenticity of many of them was then disputed, his recital closes with the observation "that these have been handed down by some ten of the 'Companions of the Prophet,' upon whose authority twice as many Tābi'ūn (the companions of the companions of the Prophet) received them, and subsequent to them innumerable men have transmitted them. These miracles are given in well-known accounts and have occurred in assemblies where many witnesses were present. The accounts of these incidents, therefore, must rest upon fact; for those who were present would not have kept quiet, when things were related which ought to have been contradicted."[1]

The object with which these miracles were coined and, as we have mentioned, in such lavish luxuriance, is too clear to be mistaken.

Far more remarkable, however, is the influence which the didactic utterances to be met with in the Gospels exercised on the development of the Mohammedan precepts as unfolded in the literature connected with the Ḥadith.

Among those whom God will protect with His shadow on the day of judgment, is mentioned "The man who does good but keeps it a secret so that his left hand knows not what his right hand has done."[2] We

[1] Shifā', Lithograph Constantinople Ed., Vol. I, pp. 243-252.

[2] Al Muwaṭṭa', Vol. IV, p. 171; *Bāb* u'l-Zakāt, nr. 15, *cf.* Muḥāribūn, nr. 5; Muslim IV, p. 188, *cf.* Iḥyā', II, p. 147. We rajul taṣaddaqa bi-ṣadaqah fa'akhfāhā ḥatta lā ta'lamu shimāluhu mâ tunfiqu (var ṣana'at) yamīnuhu, *apud* Goldziher, p. 384.

also come across the saying, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's," Matthew, XXII, 21, in the Mohammedan tradition, but indeed with a different ending.[1] Mohammed prophesies in one of his sayings to his followers that after his death would come a time when they would see horrible things. Thereupon they questioned the Prophet as to how they were to act towards their rulers: "Give them," said the Prophet, "what is due to them (to the rulers) and God will give unto you what is due to you."[2] The passages in the New Testament relating to the beatitude of the poor and their superiority over the rich, and the exclusion of the latter from the Kingdom of Heaven, an idea quite opposed to the Arab conception of life, find continual and unceasing echo in the speeches of Mohammed and those of the oldest Muslim theologians. A few examples may be cited here: "I stood" (so said the Prophet) "at the gate of Paradise and observed the majority of those who found admission there were poor; while the people of wealth were kept away from it."[3] In another tradition the same thought is expressed thus: "The rich will enter Paradise five hundred years later than the poor."[4] Once—so it is related in another place—some one passed by the Prophet. A companion (of the Prophet) informed him that the man

[1] *B.* Fitan, nr. 2. Addū ilaihim (*i.e.*, ila-l-'umarā') ḥaqqahum was'alu'llāha ḥaqqakum, *apud* Goldziher.

[2] The Commentators observe that this refers to the payment of taxes.

[3] *B.* Riqāq, nr. 51, cp. Aghānī, II, p. 191; Al-Qasṭalānī *B.* Riqāq nr. 16 (Vol. IX, p. 287); Al Muwashshā ed. Brünnow, p. 111. *Apud* Goldziher.

[4] Fakhru-d-Dīn ar-Rāzī, Mafâtîḥ, p. 538; *apud* Goldziher, Vol. II, p. 385.

who passed by belonged to the noblest of men. So distinguished was his rank that every one would desire to be connected with him by marriage, and anxiously crave for his protection. In the meantime another man passed by the Prophet concerning whom the following information was given to him. This man belongs to the band of poorer Muslims. If he were to sue for the hand of a girl, the father might refuse it; if he were to extend his protection to any one, it might be disregarded; and if he said anything, it might be ignored. Verily replied the Prophet, this man is of more worth than a world of men of that kind.[1] Many a one is clothed in this world but naked in the other.[2]

Ḥandhalah al-'Abshami: "Never a company meets and mentions the name of God, but a voice from Heaven calls out to it: Rise, for I have forgiven thee and converted thy evil into good deeds."[3] We cannot fail to notice the influence of Matthew, IX, 2-7, on this saying. Similarly, the glorification of the "poor in spirit," Matthew, V, 3, is found in the Muslim saying "the simple (the innocent, *al-bulh*) will form the largest portion of the inhabitants of Paradise."[4] In close relation to Matthew, X, 16, stands the saying reported of the companions of the Prophet, "Be innocent like the doves" (*Kûnû bulhan ka-l-ḥamâm*).

Of the most obvious and unmistakable Biblical origin is the use which is made in the Ḥadīth of the paternoster. That in earlier Muslim circles a very vague

[1] *B.* Riqāq., nr. 10; *apud* Goldziher.

[2] *B.* Fitan, nr. 6; At-Tirmidhī, II, p. 31. *Ibid.*

[3] Ibn Ḥajar, Vol. I, p. 744.

[4] Al Ya'qūbī, II, p. 115, cp. Kitābul-Adhdād, p. 214; Goldziher, p. 386.

idea prevailed of the origin of the Lord's prayer, is clearly shown by the fact that they ascribed a portion of it to Moses. On the other hand, the Prophet is reported by Abu-d-Dardā to have said :[1] "If anybody suffers or if any one's brother suffers let him say : 'Our Lord God who art in Heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy Kingdom is in Heaven[2] and on earth; just as thy mercy reigns in Heaven so show thy mercy on earth ; forgive us our faults and our sins. Thou art the God of the virtuous. Send down [a portion of] thy mercy and thy healing power on this pain, so that it may be healed.' "[3]

Not counsels of perfection merely or as the last instance shows, religious formulæ have been taken over from the Gospels into Islam, but even the very expressions have been largely appropriated. Of such the most remarkable example is the word for conveying the idea of a martyr.[4] *Shahīd* is a very old Arabic word indeed, but it owes its use in the meaning of 'a martyr' to its similarity in sound and meaning to the

[1] Goldziher, p. 386. Vol. II. According to the best authorities Abu-d-Dardā' died in 31 or 32 A.H., but some say, however, that he died after the battle of Siffīn (Iṣābah, III, 90). He is said to have embraced Islam on the day of the battle of Badr and witnessed all the subsequent battles. On Muāwiyah's appointment to the Governorship of Syria, Abu-d-Dardā' was appointed to the Qāḍhiship of Damascus which post he held to the time of his death. See Nawawī, pp. 713 and 859; Al-Bilāthurī, p. 141; Al-Muqaddasī Eng. transl., p. 178, note 3.

[2] It is left out here, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done."

[3] Abū Dāwūd, Vol. I, p. 101; *apud* Goldziher, p. 387.

[4] Goldziher, p. 387, Vol. II. Even some of the Muslim writers did not fail to observe the non-Islamic usages and practices which obtained currency among their co-religionists. Of such the most important, perhaps, is Ibn Taimiyyah. His book :

كتاب اقتضاء الصراط المستقيم و مجانبة اصحاب الجحيم

Syriac word *Sahda* which always translates the word martyr in the New Testament. The use of the word *Shahīd*, in the sense of a martyr, is due to Christian influence and comes into vogue only in the post-Qur'ānic period. Shuhadā', even in those passages of the Qur'ān where it is used, apparently, to indicate a fixed circle of believers, does not mean martyrs, but simply believers who acknowledge God and the Prophet (4 : 71, 39 : 69,

deals essentially with the non-Islamic elements in the Islam of his co-religionists. It is a work of great interest. In the earlier portions of this Ibn Taimiyyah speaks of the Christian customs and usages which have made their way among the Syrian Muslims. Shreiner says : "His treatment of the subject shows a remarkable insight in all the phenomena of Muslim religious life which are of heathen origin (p. 59)." Nor does the interest of the book cease there. Ibn Taimiyyah further deals with worship of the graves of the prophets and saints prevailing among Muslims; and by references to Ḥadīth proves such practices as contrary to Islamic principles. The keynote is struck in the following passage: "The duty of mankind is to follow that which has been announced to them by God through His messenger [*i.e.*, the Prophet] and that salvation in this as well as the world to come consists in that (p. 58)." The views of Ibn Taimiyyah have been developed by subsequent writers. To this circle belongs Shamsu-d-Dīn Ibn Qayyimi-l-Jauziyyah (691--751 A.H.). He was in every sense a true disciple of Ibn Taimiyyah. Even in the lifetime of Ibn Taimiyyah he was persecuted and thrown into prison for prohibiting the pilgrimage to Hebron. He, like his master Ibn Taimiyyah, fought the *philosophers*, Christians and Jews and taught the eternity of the reward for good actions and finality of the punishment of hell (p. 59). For the history of the theological movement the most important of his works is the 'Nūniyyah' [the full title of it is] :

كتاب الكافية الشافية فى الانتصار للفرقة الناجية

It begins with an account of those who deny attributes to God (Mu'aṭṭilah); the anthropomorphists (Mushabbihah); and the true unitarians (Muwaḥḥidah). Then follows his history of Muslim religious sects in which philosophers like Avicenna and Ibn Sab'īn, just as much as the Ash'arites and sects like the Qarāmiṭah are discussed and refuted.

A second disciple of Ibn Taimiyyah is Shamsu-d-Dīn Ḃ. Qaimāz at-Turkumānī Adh-Dhahabī (b. 673 A. H.; d. 748). He is an uncompromising opponent of the Sufis and their doctrine of the identity of God with the

57 : 18). The Christian influence, through which the word *Shahīd* was extended from its original signification of a witness, a professor of Islam, to that of a martyr, begins to operate in the post-Qur'ānic period, since when its use in the sense of martyr becomes general.

world. Al-Ghazzālī and Fakhru-d-Dīn ar Rāzī find as little favour with him as does Ibn 'Arabī. Even Al-Juwainī Imāmu-l-Haramain is not spared by him. Besides biographical and historical works Dhahabī has written such purely theological works as (1) كتاب العرش (2) اختصار كتاب للبيهقى In his works, above-mentioned, he has collected traditions and sayings of pious savants which point to the existence of God even before the creation of the world. Al-Ālūsī mentions a number of writers who have developed still further the views of Ibn Taimiyyah (pp. 60-61). Moreover, Al-Ālūsī tells of a disputed question among Muslim theologians, which is of some interest to us. It is whether it is permissible to invoke the intercession of the prophets and particularly of Mohammed or to invoke generally their help. Many have answered this question, says our author, in the affirmative, but since the earliest time there never has been a want of men who looked upon such an invocation as an offence against the true Tauḥīd and hence prohibited it. Ibn Taimiyyah shared this opinion.

It cannot be denied, says Shreiner, that the great movement which began with Ibn Taimiyyah, and in which the original tendencies of Islam found powerful expression, represents an important phase of self-consciousness of Islam to the many dangers, within and without, which threatened its existence in the 13th century of the Christian era. The crusades and still more so the incursion of the Tartars paralysed the power and dimmed the self-consciousness of the Muslims. Ash'arī dogmas could not have been of much use to the people. The pantheism of the Sūfīs has always had a debilitating effect on the morals of the people who have adopted it as their faith. The worship of saints in the Muslim world was a continual contradiction of the teachings of Mohammed.

" The appearance of Ibn Taimiyyah and his disciples, and the monotheistic reaction, the upholders of which they were, has accordingly a great historic interest. We cannot fail to recognize that Ibn Taimiyyah and his companions were capable and spirited men who boldly asserted their beliefs, as is only done under the influence of great thoughts. Their teachings, however never secured universal acceptance."

This note is taken from Shreiner's Beitr. z. Gesh. d. theol. Bewegungen im Islâm. Z.D.M.G. for the year 1899, pp. 51-67.

Some further instances of New Testament phraseology in the religious language of the Muslims may profitably be added here. It is noteworthy that the expression occurring in Matthew, VII, 5, "mote and beam" was very early incorporated in the Mohammedan literature.[1] Even Matthew, V, 13, passed in an apocryphal tradition as a saying of the Prophet about his companions: "My companions bear the same relation to my community as salt does to food, for without salt food is no good."[2] Similarly, Matthew, VII, 6, is echoed in the saying: "He who wastes learning upon people who are unworthy of it resembles one who casts pearls before swine." Even the expression to be found in Matthew, XVI, 24, though not foreign to the rabbinical literature, appears in Mohammedan phraseology, if not in the Ḥadīth.

I may add here that even the Christian idea of penance was early engrafted upon Islam. Ibn Khallikān [3] relates that the Amīr 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān, having violated the Prophet's ordinance of continence during the fasting month, "consulted the jurists respecting the mode of manifesting his repentance and expiating his sin." Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā replied: "A sin of that kind can be expiated by a fast of two consecutive months."

However hazy the knowledge of the early Muslims may have been regarding Christianity, it is clear that in later times they were fairly well acquainted with it.

[1] Z.D.M.G., XXXI, p. 765 Aghānī, XIV, p. 171, line 15. Ad-Damīrī, II, p. 70. Goldziher, Vol. II, p. 391.

[2] Al-Baghawī, Maṣābīḥu-s-Sunnah, Vol. II, p. 194, *apud* Goldziher.

[3] Vol. IV, p. 31.

Ibn Hazm, the prime-minister of 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān V (December, 1023—March, 1024), seems to have accurately grasped the principles of Christianity, for he says: "We need not be astonished at the superstition of men. Look at the Christians. They are so numerous that God only knows their numbers. They have among them men of great intelligence and princes of great nobility. Nevertheless *they believe that three is one and one is three; that one of the three is the Father, another the Son, another the Spirit; that the Father is, and is not, the Son; that a man is, and is not, God; that the Messiah is God in every respect, and yet not the same as God; that he who has existed for all eternity has been created.* One of their sects, the members of which they call Jacobites and which number hundreds of thousands, believe even that the Creator Himself was scourged, crucified, and put to death; so that the universe for three days was deprived of its Governor."[1]

In the social sphere Christian and Persian influences are clearly manifest. Wine, music, fine silken apparel[2] and sculpture came into fashion. Music owed its introduction to the Persian captives of war who came in great numbers to Mekka[3] and taught the Arabs

[1] Dozy, Musulmans d' Espagne, III, p. 342.

[2] De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, Vol. I, p. 40.

[3] Von Kremer, Vol. I, pp. 40-41. Aghānī, Vol. I, p. 194. Ibn Musajjiḥ died in the reign of Walīd I, *i.e.*, between somewhere 86 and 96 A.H. It appears that Ṭuwais made his name as a musician even before Ibn Musajjiḥ. He was born on the day of Mohammed's death (8th June, 632 A.D.), weaned on the day of Abū Bakr's death, circumcised on the day of Omar's assassination, married on the day of the murder of Othmān, and a son was born to him on the day 'Alī was killed. These curious coincidences were the origin of the proverb among the Arabs: "More unlucky than Ṭuwais." He began to acquire fame in the last years of the reign of Othmān (Ibn Badrūn, p. 64). Ṭuwais was the first, since Islam, who sang

to sing with the current musical instruments : the Tabor (*daff*), Tambourine (*ṭambûr*), the Reed-pipe (na'y), the *Lute* (*'ūd*). Ibn Musajjiḥ is mentioned as the first who introduced the Persian music into Arabia. Mas'ūdī says[1] that as early as the time of Yazīd taste for music had become widely diffused; and we even find in Mekka and Medina, at this time, a centre and focus of music and song whence were recruited musicians for the court

with grace and elegance and caused to be heard at Medina regulated airs. He died at Suwaidā' in the beginning of Walīd's reign about the year 86 or 87 of the Hegira (705—6 A.D.). Among other musicians of this time are mentioned 'Azzatu-l-Mailā' and Sā'ib khāthir. 'Azzatu'-l-Maila' lived at Medina. Her popularity grew to such an extent that pious Muslims were scandalised at the taste for music which had come into vogue and complained to Sa'īd ībnu-l-'Aṣī, the Governor of Medina for the Caliph Mu'āwiyah. They accused 'Azzah of corrupting the faithful by music which had been forbidden by the Prophet. Sā'ib khāthir lived in Medina. His father was a Persian war captive whom the family Laith had purchased. It is said that he was the first to sing, at Medina, with the lute. He perished in the bloodshed which followed the entry of the cruel Muslim in Medina during the reign of Yazīd. Muslim Ibn Muḥriz received his first lessons in song from Ibn Musajjiḥ. He afterwards left Mekka to travel in Persia and Syria. The author of the Kitābul-l-Aghāni says: Ibn Muḥriz became acquainted with melodies and songs of the Persians and Syrians. He excluded those that did not please his compatriots, adopting those that did. Then he combined them together and from this combination he derived the airs which he composed for the Arabic verses. It apparently seems, says Caussin De Perceval, that Ibn Musajjiḥ did not alone establish the system of the Arab music of the first centuries of the Hegira but Ibn Muḥriz has also had a share in it or at all events was the one who fixed and settled its rules. He was also the inventor of *Ramal*. Ibn Muḥriz was the first to sing Arab verses in pairs; an example which was soon followed by all his colleagues. He used to say : "You can't sing a complete melody upon a single verse." Ibn Suraij was the first at Mekka to accompany his songs upon a lute.—[Caussianę De Perceval, *J. A.*, November—December, 1873, p. 460., Isḥāq Al-Mauṣilī, the greatest musician at the time of the 'Abbāsids, used to say : "Four men excelled formerly in the art of singing : two Mekkans—Ibn Muḥriz and Ibn Suraij; two Medinites—Ma'bad and Mālik.—[*Ibid.*, p. 500].

[1] *Apud* Weil, Vol. I, p. 338, note (1).

of Damascus. Von Kremer deals exhaustively with the history of the introduction and growth of the use of wine and music at the court of Damascus; I need therefore only add that, among the Caliphs of Spain, Ḥakam I seems to have been the first to drink the forbidden juice. His namesake Ḥakam II (961—976) strove to stem this tendency by the most drastic measures, but he met with as little success as did Omar Ibn 'Abdi-l-'Aziz at Damascus.

If the prohibition of the use of wine was disregarded, this was equally the case with the prohibition of the making of human images. In the East Muslims apparently observed the prohibition against representing living creatures scrupulously, but in Muslim Spain scant attention was paid to it. We find that a statue was raised to 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān's wife Zahrā', in the Madīnatu-z-Zahrā', a palace built by 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān III, in honour of his beloved mistress. Images of animals are found on the fountains and a lion on the aqueduct. We also hear of a statue at the gate of Cordova.[1]

It is not to be wondered at that Islam and Christianity, existing side by side, as they did for centuries together, should act and react upon each other. No religious system, however exclusive, can avoid the slow and silent influence of other systems with which it may come into contact. To such influences are to be traced the origin of countless religious sects and heresies and even independent religious systems which have guided

[1] I am indebted to my friend, Mr. T. A. Archer, for drawing my attention to Haine's Christianity and Islam in Spain. It is a most admirable little book. See p. 146; see Mr. Ameer Ali's "Spirit of Islam" and "History of the Saracens" for further information.

and controlled the fate of humanity since the dawn of history. The fusion of Islam and the religion of Zoroaster resulted in Bābīism, and Sikhism is but an amalgamation of Hinduism and the religion of the Prophet of Arabia.

The powerful religious movement in Bengal, inaugurated within living memory, the Brahma-Samaj movement, is indeed a typical instance of the result of the collision of various religious systems: Hinduism, Christianity and Islam. Nor is it a mere passing ripple. It shows signs of life and vitality and holds out promise of a bright future.

As a counterpart to the discussion of the influence of Christianity on Islam, we might here hurriedly glance at the influence of Islam upon Christianity. The present writer must, however, speak with the utmost caution and reserve, as the subject is alike novel, vast and difficult. For the purposes of this question a slight digression may be forgiven, as it will be necessary to refer to the history of Spain or Gothic Gaul, where the sun of Muslim learning rose to its meridian.[1]

Possibly owing to contact with Islam and the necessarily concomitant Muslim influence, Spain very early "gained a reputation for introducing innovation into the doctrines and practices of the true faith, and even of priding itself on its ingenuity in this way." Let us take now the several heresies which bear traces of Islam. During the eighth century, presumably, a heresy is mentioned as having arisen in Septimania (Gothic Gaul) which consisted in denying the need of confession to a priest, on the ground, rational and unimpeachable,

[1] See Haine's Christianity and Islam in Spain, pp. 116 *et seq.*

that men ought to confess to God alone. As is well known, Islam admits no priests in its religion and hence no confession. This heresy is clearly an outcome of the pressure of Islamic ideas which the Christians of Septimania could not have wholly escaped. Though the Protestants reject the doctrine of confession, we cannot refrain from thinking that the heresy in question, so shocking to the orthodox Catholic belief but so akin to Islam, owed its birth to current Muslim ideas.

But this heresy sinks into insignificance before the heretical view of the Trinity held by Migetus (*circa* 750). It would take me far afield to discuss the views held by Migetus at length; suffice it to say that he actually denied the divinity of the Word, making in this an approach to Islam.[1] By far the most important and the most famous is the adoptionist heresy, in which the influence of Islam is not only obvious, but is even acknowledged by eminent writers on Church history. Mariana, the Spanish historian, and Baronius, the apologist for the Roman Church, held that the object of the new heresiarchs was "by lowering the character of Christ, to pave the way for union between Christians and Mahomedans."[2] Stated briefly, the new doctrine was that Jesus, in so far as His manhood was concerned, was Son of God by adoption.[3]

Nor did the Iconoclastic movement, fraught as it was with most ominous consequences for the Byzantine Empire, wholly escape Islamic influence. In this connection it may be mentioned that Claudius, the Bishop of Turin (appointed in 828), who set to work to

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 117-8. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 120. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 124 KB, HI.

3—1903B

deface, burn and abolish all images and crosses in his bishopric, was born and bred in Muslim Spain.[1]

That Claudius saw much in Islam and the Muslims to appreciate and admire is undoubted; since we have the direct statement of one of his opponents who said that "the Jews praised him and called him the wisest among the Christians; and that he on his side highly commended them and *the Saracens*."[2] The influence of Islam upon Christianity is a subject which calls for an independent monograph. I have attempted no more than a broad outline. It is still unbroken ground, and from what has transpired in the course of this short enquiry, it is clear that a comparative study of the Qur'ān and the Bible, the Mohammedan tradition and the works of the Christian fathers, the history of the religious movements of Christendom and the Caliphate would amply repay any labour bestowed on it. Its result will be but a confirmation of the eternal truth that the human heart is constantly striving after something nobler and higher; that a creed which satisfies the wants and requirements of one age becomes effete and worn out in another; and that God speaks to men "at sundry times and in diverse manners". Islam owes as much to Christianity as Christianity does to Islam. Nor can this fact be deemed to be discreditable to either; since they are but the reflection of one and the same light.

True Islam is true Christianity, their mission being identical. In the language of the Apostle James:

[1] See Maqqarī, Vol. II, p. 446; *cf.* Finlay, History of Greece, Vol. II, p. 75.

[2] Fleury, V, p. 398; *apud* Haine's Christianity and Islam in Spain.

" Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world." This is the burden of all religions and this, the burden of Islam.

I have dwelt upon this question longer than I intended to do.

I shall now pass on to the causes of the decline of the Omayyad and the 'Abbāsid dynasties. This involves the consideration of those social and religious problems with which the Caliphate was constantly confronted and which slowly and steadily undermined the foundation of the Arab government of the Omayyads and the *Persianized* rule of the 'Abbāsids.

Let us go back to the murder of Othmān, and consider its effect upon the Caliphate. It was an event of a most momentous character, since it destroyed once for all the sanctity of the person of the Caliph, and hence it marks the transition from theocracy to royalty. The discordant elements, which had been kept down by the genius of the Prophet and his two able successors, Abū Bakr and Omar, were again unchained, and Arabia became till the time of the Caliph 'Abdu-l-Malik the play-ground of party faction and adventurous spirits. In the troublous time that followed the death of Othmān it was the law of might that prevailed, and the Omayyads, unquestionably, were the mightiest and the most powerful. The resistance of the Shī'ites, who had already suffered a serious defeat near 'Ainu-l-Wardāh (65 A.H.), was finally suppressed at the battle of Ḥarūrā (67 H.) The opposition in the Ḥijāz continued until the taking of Mekka and the death of 'Abdullah

Ibnu-z-Zubair (73 H.). The war with the Khārijites dragged on until the year 77 of the Hegira.[1]

If 'Abdullah Ibnu-z-Zubair had marched on to Damascus, where he counted numerous adherents, during the confusion and disturbance which existed there, the Omayyad dynasty would then probably have come to an end. But 'Abdullah left, even in Arabia and 'Irāq, the lead of all the expeditions to his generals, and remained inactive in Mekka.[2] The administrative genius of 'Abdu-l-Malik found ample scope for its action in the wild anarchy that prevailed, and by dint of his ability he crushed all obstacles to the rule of the Omayyads and enthroned himself at the Court of Damascus as the undisputed ruler of the Muslim Empire.

The Khārijites and Shī'ites, under the blows of the generals, had no longer the power to oppose openly the Omayyad government, but their principle of hostility to the ruling dynasty did not fail to develop and adapt itself to the new circumstances which had come into being under the empire of the Arabs in the East. As Van Vloten well says: "La lutte [arabe] politique des factions entre dans la période sociale et religieuse."

The Omayyad government, from its very outset, alienated the sympathy of the more religious section of the Mohammedans. We are indebted to Ibn Qutaibah for transmitting to us a letter which Husain, the grandson of the Prophet, is alleged to have addressed to Mu'āwiyah, the founder of the Omayyad dynasty. Whether genuine or apocryphal—for that is beside

[1] Van Vloten, Recherches sur la domination Arabe, p. 36.
[2] Weil, Vol. I, p. 338.

the mark here—this letter expresses sentiments which, without a doubt, were very largely shared by the generality of the Muslims of that age. It runs thus : "Your letter has reached me in which you speak of evil reports about me that have come to your knowledge and which, you say, you would never have expected of me as being beneath my dignity. Well, God alone leads people to good actions. As to what you say about my intention of rising against you, this could only have been conveyed to you by flatterers and slanderers who sow discord among men. These deceitful and irreligious men have lied. I have never intended to fight with you, nor have I ever intended to oppose you, although I fear that God will hold me responsible for leaving you alone [and not fighting you] and your unjust party, the party of tyrants and the help-mates of the accursed one. Are you not the murderer of Ḥujr, the devotee and the companions of Ḥujr, the pious and God-fearing who were averse to heresies and who exhorted people to do good and forbade them from evil? Yet you killed them wrongly and unjustly after giving them faithful and inviolate promises of immunity and safety. In this act you defied God and thought lightly of His name. Are you not also the murderer of 'Amr Ibnu-l-Hamiq whose face was worn out by long devotion? You killed him after holding out promises to him, which would have brought down even the mountain goats from their lairs. And are you not the man who adopted Ziyād as your brother, during the time of Islam and alleged that he was the son of Abū Sufyān, whereas the Prophet of God had laid it down that Al-Walad li-l-firāsh wa li-l-'ahiri-l-ḥajar (see Goldziher, Vol. I, p. 188, note 2; Fakhrī, p. 135;

Ibn Khallikān, Vol. IV, p. 247)? Then you invested him with power to kill Muslims and cut off their hands and feet and crucify them on the trunks of palm trees. By God! Mu'āwiyah, you behave in a manner that would lead people to think that you are not one of the Muslims and they have no part or lot in you. Are you not again the murderer of Al Haḍhramī, concerning whom Ziyād wrote to you that he was of the same religion as 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib? Well then, the religion of 'Alī is no other than the religion of his cousin [the Prophet] through whose instrumentality you are occupying the position you now hold. Were it not for Islam, your highest nobility and that of your ancestors would have consisted in your making the two journeys in summer and winter [for purposes of trade]. But God has relieved you from this through us as a favour granted unto you. And you have said among other things 'Guard the interest of your own self, of your religion, and of the followers of the Prophet.' Verily I know nothing that safeguards better my interest and the interest of my religion and the followers of Mohammed than waging holy war against you. If I do this, I shall be doing a pious deed; but if I do not, I seek the forgiveness of God for failing in my religion and ask Him to guide me to what is pleasing unto Him. And you also threaten me by saying that you will show enmity to me the moment I show enmity to you. Then show your enmity to me in any way that it occurs to you, for, by my life, you have of old been the enemy of the righteous, and I fear that [by this course of conduct] you are only doing injury to yourself inasmuch as good deeds are spoilt by evil ones. Fear God, O Mu'āwiyah, and know that God has a book which fails not to record

the largest or the smallest sin, and know also that God will never forgive your killing men on mere suspicion and punishing them upon false charges and your appointing as your successor a youth who drinks wine and hunts with dogs. I can see in this only death to your soul and ruin to your religion and grief to your subjects.''[1] The rule of the Omayyads was regarded by their contemporaries in no way as a continuation of the rule of the Prophet and his companions, inasmuch as it rested, not upon Islam which was the mainstay and strength of the first two Caliphs, but upon conquering force. This fact, indeed, formed the greatest source of weakness to the Omayyads, and explains the constant opposition to their rule, raised in the name of Allah and His Prophet, which the Omayyads had ever and anon to face and overcome. Furthermore, the irreconcilable hostility of 'Irāq against the Omayyads did much to imperil their rule. 'Irāq, the adopted home of Arab aristocracy, figures throughout this dynasty as the rallying-point of almost all the insurrections and rebellions against the Omayyads. But the utterly unsympathetic policy of the Omayyads towards their subject races endangered more than anything else the existence of this dynasty. It inaugurated that tremendous social movement which was directed against not them alone but against the entire

[1] MS. Khuda Bukhsh's Oriental Public Library, Bankipore. Folio 86. Gayangos, the translator of Maqqarī's Hist. of Moh. Dynasties in Spain, has shown in Vol. I, Appendix E, that this work is wrongly ascribed to Ibn Qutaibah. He seems to think that it is written by some one who lived even earlier than Ibn Qutaibah. Whether it is written by Ibn Qutaibah or some one else, this book (As-Siyāsah wa-l-Imāmah) contains a great deal of information which is rarely found in other works. It is a work which may be profitably printed. See also Brockelmann, p. 122, Arab. Litteratur.

Arab rule. It was the movement, the Shu'ūbiyyah movement, initiated by the *Mawālī* and encouraged and countenanced by the God-fearing, just as much as by the aspiring adventurer, though with wholly different motives. The pious and God-fearing Muslims saw with horror and amazement the cruel treatment meted out by the Arabs of pure race and the members of the ruling body to their fellow-Muslims of non-Arab origin or *Mawālī*, since this attitude offended alike the Law of God and the precepts of the Prophet, the bold adventurer saw in the discontent and disaffection of his fellow subjects an opportunity for seeking his own ends and promoting his own interests. The whole situation is faithfully reflected in the speeches of Yazīd ibn Muhallab and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī recorded in one of the earliest Arab historians. Yazīd ibn Muhallab, on taking Baṣrah from 'Adī, the Governor of the Caliph Yazīd, Ibn 'Abdi-l-Malik, addressed the people of that city thus: "It was our indignation on your behalf that [has made us wage war with the Caliph]. Then look for a man who will do justice, *treat you equally*, uphold the Book of God and the precepts of the Prophet and follow the mode and life of the Khulafā'u-r-Rāshidūn (*i.e.*, the first four Caliphs)." This speech of Yazīd, who was impelled by his own selfish motives to rise against the Caliph, very forcibly shows us the use which ambitious generals tried to make of the seething mass of discontent among the people. We will place along with this what Ḥasan al-Baṣrī has to say about the Omayyads, and which, to our mind, echoes the current sentiments of all pious Muslims. A man said to Ḥasan: "It seems as though you are pleased with the people of Syria." To this replied Ḥasan: "May God bring shame and punishment upon

the people of Syria. Are they not the people who violated the sanctuary of the Prophet of God for three days and permitted Nabathæans and Copts to indulge [in all kinds of excesses]? Are they not those who hesitated and scrupled not from committing sins and violating its sacredness; for they placed and aimed catapults against the *Baitu-llāh* [the house of God]?"[1]

Such was the spirit in which the pious Muslims looked upon the Omayyad rule, and such was the spirit which fostered the growth of the various sects: Khārijī-ism and Shī'ism, Murji'ah and Qadariyya, and countless others which sprang up within the bosom of the Caliphate and shook its ponderous fabric.[2] Such was the spirit which explains the opposition of Harith Ibn Suraij, the revolt of the Khārijite 'Abdullah Ibn Yaḥyā and the insurrection of the Khārijite-Mawālī under the leadership of one Abū 'Alī of Kūfah, a Mawlā of Banū Hārith. "We have heard"—so said the rebels—"a wonderful Qur'ān which leads us to the right path. We

[1] De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, Vol. I, p. 59.

[2] Ibn Hazm looks upon the Mu'tazilah, Murji'ah, Shī'ah and the Khawārij as the chief sects of Islam. Then he passes on in his Milal and Niḥal to the consideration of those sects who are considered as Muslims, but to whom he denies that character: such as those who believe in the transmigration of soul, who deny that the Sūrah of Yūsuf is a part of the Qur'ān, who consider the use of the fat of the swine permissible. Among the Shī'ah, he tells us, there are many who extravagantly assert that 'Alī and the Imāms who came after him were Gods. Others consider 'Alī and the Imāms as prophets, and believe in the transmigration of soul, such as the poet Sayyidu-l-Ḥimyarī. Many of these Shī'ah, he further informs us, considered Abu-l-Khaṭṭāb Mohammed ibn Zainab as God. Others believed in the prophetship of Mughirah Ibn 'Abī Sa'īd, Abū Manṣūr al-'Ijli. Bazighal-Ḥā'ik, Bunān ibn Sam'ān at-Tamīnī and others. Ibn Hazm ascribes the origin of such and similar sects to the Persians, who outwardly professed Islam and love for the family of the Prophet, but really sought vengeance upon Islam for the loss of their power by introducing beliefs and ideas which were calculated to

have accepted its teachings and we associate no companion with God. This *God has sent the Prophet for the whole of mankind and has withheld him from none.*" This indeed, says Goldziher, is the earliest attempt in foreign circles, though in a modest shape, to reject the doctrine of the superiority of the Arabs. It took place as early as the reign of Mu'āwiyah. This, moreover, explains to us why the oldest historians of Islam make the Khārijites the representatives of the Shu'ūbiyyah party. This, however, was merely the beginning of the larger movement near at hand. The Wawālī applying themselves to learned studies, soon rose to intellectual eminence, but in spite of their accomplishments they were refused political and social equality with the full-blooded Arabs. And in proportion to their learning and eminence grew their discontent against the Government which established hateful social distinctions and oppressive legal disabilities and imposed extortionate taxes upon the Mamālī and the

estrange people from Islam and bring into discredit the companions of the Prophet. Ibn Hazm concludes his exposition of this subject thus :—" Know that the religion of Allah is open and not secret. It is a revelation which admits of no secret. It rests entirely upon proof. There is no laxity in it. Therefore, beware of him who requires you to follow blindly and without reason, and who assures you that there is in the religion of Islam any secrets or anything which necessitates allegorical interpretation. That man is certainly one who leads you to falsehood. Know that the Messenger of God has kept nothing a secret in his religion which he intended to be entrusted to wife, or daughter or uncle or uncle's son or a companion and to be kept secret from men generally. He has no secret, no allegory, no concealed doctrine, other than what he announced to all men. Had he concealed anything he would have failed in the discharge of his mission."

It is interesting to note that Ibnu-s-Subkī has denounced Ibn Hazm's Milal and Niḥal in strong terms. He says that it is one of the worst books and that the learned among the orthodox have always forbidden the study of it. See Z.D.M.G., Vol. LII, pp. 465-468.

neo-converts. Thus in each succeeding decade the gulf between the Omayyad government and its subject races became wider and wider. We are happily in possession of the report of a conversation between the Caliph 'Abdu-l-Malik and the theologian Zuhrī, which illustrates the learning and piety of the Mawālī.

Ibn Sahl relates in his travels that Az-Zuhrī, the famous theologian, happening to be once at the Court of the Caliph, introduced himself to the commander of the faithful. The following conversation took place between the ruler and the *savant* :—

" Ca.—Whence does thou come? Zuhrī—From Mekka. Ca.—Who exercised authority over the people at the time of your residence there? Zuhrī—' Aṭā ', son of Rabāḥ. Ca.—Is he an Arab or a Mawlā? Zuhrī—A Mawlā. Ca.—How did he succeed in obtaining this influence over the Mekkans? Zuhrī—By his piety and knowledge of the traditions. Ca.—Just so distinction, among men, comes to the God-fearing and the learned in the traditions. Well, now, who stands in prominence in Yaman? Zuhrī—Tā'ūs, son of Kaisān. Ca.—Is he an Arab or a Mawlā? Zuhrī—A Mawlā. Ca.—How has he attained this influence? Zuhrī—By the very same qualities as ' Aṭā '. Thus the Caliph questioned him about all the provinces of Islam and was informed by Zuhrī that in Egypt Yazīd b. Abī Ḥabīb, in Syria, Makḥūl, the son of a captive of war from Kābul whom a Hudhailite, in whose service he was, granted his freedom, in Mesopotamia, Maimūm B. Mihrān, in Khurāsān, Al-Ḍhaḥḥāk, in Baṣrah, Al Ḥasan ibnu-l-Ḥasan, in Kūfah,

Ibrāhīm An-Nakha'ī; pure Mawālī who played the rôle of leaders in the Muslim society. When the Caliph expressed his astonishment at this state of affairs, which must inevitably lead to the Mawālī wresting the rule from the Arabs and making the latter their subjects, Zuhrī said: "So it is, O Commander of the Faithful! This is effected by the command of God and His religion; he who observes these, attains to authority; he who neglects them, goes under."[1]

However distinguished the Mawālī might have been, the Omayyad government would not concede to them political rights. From this passage it is obvious that even at the time of the Caliph 'Abdu-l-Malik the Mawālī were slowly rising to the front. The movement headed by Mukhtār was the outcome of widespread discontent which pervaded Muslim society: discontent arising from the ungodly life of the Omayyad sovereigns, their reckless defiance of Islam and its precepts and their perverse and oppressive administrative and fiscal policies, which sought to convert the subject-races, even Muslims themselves of recent conversion, into "hewers of wood and drawers of water". Such were the real reasons of Mukhtār's revolt, though ostensibly it aimed at establishing the rights of Ibnu-l-Ḥanafiyyah. The cruelty of Ḥajjāj and his offensive political measures, which seriously affected the Mawālī and the neo-converts, further tended to alienate the sympathy, what little still remained, not merely of the

[1] Ad-Damīrī, II, p. 107; In 'Iqd, II, pp. 95-6, a similar account is given of a conversation between the Governor 'Isâ, B. Mūsā and the theologian Ibn Abī Lailā. Goldziher, Vol. I, p. 115. About 'Aṭā', son of Rabāḥ, see Ibn Khall, Vol. II, p. 205; about Makḥûl see Ibn Khall, Vol. III, p. 437; *cf.* p. 438.

Mawālī, but even of the Arabs themselves from the Syrian rule.—The rebellion of Ibn Ash'ath, looked upon in its true light, was but a desperate effort of the 'Irāqians to throw off the Syrian yoke, and our authorities fully bear out this view of Ibn Ash'ath's insurrection. Abū Mikhnaf alleges that in the camp at Dair Jamājim there were 100,000 Arab warriors (Muqātilah) and quite as many Mawālī who went apparently with their Arab lords. It was customary for the Arab lords to take along with them their Mawālī (clients) to battle and make them fight on foot; while they themselves fought on horse-back, not unlike the feudal lords and their serfs in the Middle Ages. The insurrection started among the 'Irāqian troops in Sijistān who were joined by the garrisons of the rest of the provinces and for whom Kūfah and Baṣrah threw their gates wide open. The most distinguished Arab Chiefs took part in Ibn Ash'ath's rebellion. Such were: Ibn Ash'ath of Kindah, Jarīr b. Sa'īd b. Qais of Hamdān,[1] 'Abdu-l-Mu'min b. Shabath b. Rib'ī of Tamīm,[2] Bistām b. Maṣqalah b. Hubairah of Bakr, Quraishites like Mohammed b. Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ (Ṭab., p. 1099, 2nd series), Quraishites like 'Ubaidullah b. 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān al 'Abshamī, 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān b. 'Abbās al-Hāshimī, *savants* like the Qāḏhī Ash-Sha'bī and Al-Kalbī, the friend of Abu Mikhnaf.[3]

In the insurrections both of Al-Mukhtar and of Ibn Ash'ath the Mawālī or the clients were to be counted by thousands, but it should be borne in mind that neither of

[1] Prof. Browne, pp. 229, 233.

[2] See Wellhausen's Das Arabische Reich und sein Sturz, pp. 145, 153, *et seq.*; Anon, p. 340.

[3] Ṭabarī, II, pp. 1056, 1088, 1096, 1099.

them was a purely Mawālī insurrection, as has been held by some writers of repute. The Mawālī, oppressed and trodden under foot by the aggressive policy of the Omayyad imperialism, would naturally cast in their lot with rebels who aimed at putting an end to that government. In both these rebellions the Mawālī had their own interest to serve, but they only played a secondary rôle.

The nature of these rebellions cannot be mistaken. They were wars, not of the Mawālī against the Arabs, but of the 'Irāqians against the Syrians. It was a war between the two provinces of the Arab Empire—'Irāq and Syria; each of them ever and anon striving for the first place in the Empire. Ibn Qutaibah, in his *As-Siyāsah wa-l-Imāmah*,[1] preserves an instructive speech purporting to have been addressed by Aḥnaf ibn Qais to Abū Mūsā, just before the arbitration took place at Dūmatu-l-Jandal: "Consider what you are about and think well of the consequences of your decision, for if you betray 'Irāq, 'Irāq will be lost to you. If 'Amr falls in with your view and accepts 'Alī, well and good; if not, let it be agreed upon that the people of 'Irāq be permitted to choose men of the Quraish [to decide upon a Caliph] and the people of Syria to choose whom they will."

This passage serves as a key to the entire situation. It already marks out the policy which 'Irāq intended to follow, should the Omayyad cause triumph. The feeling

[1] Ṭabarī, II, p. 108; MS. Folio, 65. It is significant that Ḥajjāj kept the Syrians far away from there ('Irāq) for fear that they might be infected by the evil spirit of the 'Irāquians. 'Irāq was the centre of the Shi'ites as well as theocratical opposition. Wellhausen, p. 311. In this Ḥajjāj was probably following the advice of Mu'āwiyah to his son Yazīd. Fakhrī, p. 136; Ibn Khall, Vol. I, p. 238.

of bitterness between 'Irāq and Syria was further intensified by the presence of the Syrian troops whom Ḥajjāj had quartered there. They were the symbols of a foreign yoke, and the Arab aristocracy could not for a moment endure to see themselves slighted and insulted by the plebeian Ḥajjāj.

In the panegyric which he composed upon Ibn Ash'ath, the poet A'shā of Hamdān describes to us the feelings of the Arab aristocracy towards Ḥajjāj.[1] "God and the pride of Ibn Mohammed (ibn Ash'ath) and his descent from the royal family, even older than the Thamūd, do not admit of thy associating with unworthy men, the offspring of slaves (Thaqafīs like Ḥajjāj). How many an ancestor of thine has borne the crown on his shining forehead. The home of honour and glory lies with Mohammed (ibn Ash'ath) and Sa'īd (ibn Qais), with Ashajj (the scarred one) and Qais." [By Ashajj, here, one of the ancestors of Ash'ath is meant (*cf.* Anon, Ahlwardt, p. 355. Qais is the father of the famous Sa'īd of Hamdān, whose grandson Jarīr made common cause with the grandson of Ash'ath.)]

The Omayyad rule thus forfeited the allegiance of the Arab chiefs and lost the loyalty of the Mawālī, who always threw in their weight against the Government, whenever an opportunity offered itself to them. And they had, indeed, abundant reasons for doing so: "The ' clients ' were, indeed, regarded by the Arabs as an inferior race little better than slaves." "Nothing," says the historian Ṭabarī, in speaking of the revolt of Al-Mukhtār (whose supporters consisted to a great extent

[1] Aghānī, Vol. V, p. 153.

of 'clients' or non-Arab Muslims, Mawālī) "so much exasperated the [Arab] Kūfians as to see Al-Mukhtār assign to the 'clients' their share of the spoil. 'You have taken from us our clients,' they cried, 'who are the spoil which God hath destined for us with all this province. We have liberated them, hoping for a reward from God, but you do not trouble yourself about this, and cause them to share in our booty'."[1] The following passage, taken from Goldziher, will sufficiently illustrate the contempt which the Arabs felt for them :

"Even the blood of the Mawlā—according to the statement of an Ārab of the Banū Shāiban—is said to have been quite different from that of the Arab, so that if the blood of the two was examined after their death, a difference might be perceived."[2] Isolated and by way of exception only is a good word said on behalf of the Mawālī by the champions of Arabism (*Araberthum*) who then were the poets. Rather the Arab poetry, especially that of the Omayyad period, is full of sneering and contempt for those in whose veins did not flow the Arab blood. The poet, Al-Akhṭal, does not know of a more effective way of reviling Arabs whom he wishes to hold up to public scorn than by calling them the people of Azqubād (a place in the district of Maisān), *i.e.*, by denying them the Arab character. To belong to Maisān was held among them as not being very honourable. It is characteristic—and indeed at a much later time—that the Mawlā Abu-l-'Atāhiyah should abuse an Arab opponent, the poet Wālibah, the tutor of Abū

1 Browne, p. 234.
2 Goldziher, Vol. I, pp. 118-9.

Nu'ās, by saying that it would be better for him to join the Mawālī, since he was unfit and unworthy to associate with Arabs. Hence to be the Mawlā of an Arab tribe was considered an honourable rank in comparison with Persian origin.

Isḥāq Al-Mauṣilī (under Hārūnu-r-Rashīd), who called himself a descendant of Banū-l-Aḥrār was exposed, so long as he was not affiliated to an Arab tribe, to the calumny of the Arab Ibn Jāmi, inasmuch as till his affiliation Isḥāq could be called a "bastard" with impunity. His affiliation to the tribe of Khuzaimah alone could protect him from such revilings, and he could say: "Though descended from Aḥrār and proud of my rank, I have been protected from calumny only by Khāzim and the son of Khāzim."[1]

Intermarriages between the Arabs and the Mawālī were looked upon as *mésalliances*, and the question was not omitted to be discussed whether pious non-Arabs could marry Arab women in Paradise. That such alliances—at least in this world—were looked upon as improper or at all events unusual (*abnormität*) appears from the literary activity of Al-Haitham b. 'Adī, who wrote a special work dealing with those Mawālī who had married into Arab families. The question whether such unions were permissible remained for a long time undecided. Even the theologian was constrained to busy himself with it; a fact which clearly proves the difficulty in overcoming the prejudices of the Arab aristocracy

[1] Aghānī, V, p. 56; *apud* Goldziher, p. 119. *Cf.* Hidāyaha, Vol. I, p. 112; Goldziher, p. 132.

in spite of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.[1] The Arab prejudice against the Mawālī would not tolerate even their worshipping in the same mosque as themselves. In Kūfah (our authority refers to the 2nd century of the Hegira) the Mawālī appear to have been made to perform their devotions in a special mosque of their own.[2] In provinces (such as Khurāsān) where they existed in large numbers, they seem to have assumed a corporate unity. Arab histories are full of anecdotes disparaging to the Mawālī, who are constantly accused of perjury and speaking falsehood.

The Omayyad government, therefore, drawing its support no longer from Islam and its precepts, and forfeiting the loyalty and allegiance of its subjects by its oppressive and short-sighted measures, was eventually thrown back upon its soldiery who could but ill protect its Empire. Military strength, without loyalty on the part of the subjects, is not, and has never been, the soundest support of any government. The seeds of

[1] Goldziher, Vol. I, p. 130, and the authorities cited therein. In Ibn Ḥazm [MS.] on Folio 90 occurs the following passage :—

و منهم ضرار بن عمرو المتلهم احد شيوخ المعتزلة وكالت فيه ثلاثة

(sic) اعاجيب كان معتزليّا كوفيّا و كان عربيّا شعوبيّا و زوّج ابنته من علج اسلم

و كان يختلف اليه

This passage illustrates three important facts. In the first place, it shows that Kūfah was not a place where the Mu'tazilī principles throve; in the second, that even up to the time of Ibn Ḥazm it was considered strange for an Arab to be a Shu'ūbiyy; and finally, that marriage of an Arab lady with a *non-Arab* Muslim was looked upon as late as Ibn Ḥazm's time as an extraordinary phenomenon.

[2] Ṭabarī, III, p. 295; Goldziher, p. 120, *cf.* De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, Vol. I, p. 69.

discontent were scattered broadcast, and the ground was ripe to bear fruit when there appeared " the celebrated Mission " or "Propaganda" (Da'wah) of the 'Abbāsids, which working silently but surely on the abundant elements of disaffection which already existed, undermined the Omayyad power and within thirty years overthrew the tottering edifice of their dynasty.[1] Nor is there any reason for surprise at the rapid and astounding success of Abū Muslim. The part played by the Persians in the " Mission " or " Propaganda " of the 'Abbāsids is clear enough from the fact that Persian was the prevalent language in the army of Abū Muslim.[2] The home of the 'Abbāsid conspiracy as well as Sabā'ism, the extreme wing of the Shī'ite party was Kūfah. Both these movements were inaugurated and continued by the Persian Mawālī and were directed against Arab imperialism in Islam. The two movements correspond exactly in all essential points : in teaching, in method of Propaganda, and in scene of activity. Two other particulars might also be added. The wooden clubs, the national weapon of the lower orders of the Persians, were called ' Kāfir-Kūbāt ' (maces wherewith to beat the infidels). Wellhausen says : Sie wurde schon von den Chaschabija des Muchtar, nicht erst von denen des Abu Muslim, die ketzerkeule genannt, Tabari, 2,694. Further, the Mawālī of his country seat at Khutarniyah in Kūfah, formed the oldest supporters of Al-Mukhtār, and from Khutarniyah, precisely, it was that came Abū

[1] Browne, pp. 236 *et seq.* I have deliberately refrained from entering into this question, as the reader will find in Prof. Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, a most learned and luminous discussion of the subject.

[2] Ṭabarī, III, p. 65.

Muslim.[1] Even if we doubt the correctness of these statements, they do not thereby lose their significance, for their invention must have been owing to some motive and the motive is enough for us. That the ʻAbbāsids, after they had triumphed, repudiated the Shīʻites is not to be wondered at. They were troublesome to them, and after they had done their work, they might go where they would.

There exists therefore a close resemblance between the unsuccessful rebellion of Al-Mukhtār and the successful revolution effected by Abū Muslim. Though the fire in the year 67 was seemingly quenched in blood, yet sparks lurked under the ashes which blew over from Kūfah to Khurāsān. Khurāsān was a more favourable ground than Kūfah and offered greater opportunities for success. The Mawālī there were more compact and the Arabs, in comparison with them, far weaker than at Kūfah. From Khurāsān the rebellion started and, like wild-fire, it set all the provinces ablaze. Its initial stages and its subsequent developments may be studied in Prof. Browne's Literary History of Persia.

With the accession of the ʻAbbāsids to the Caliphate the despised and the oppressed Mawālī rose rapidly to power. Persian influences have been admirably described by Von Kremer, so I need not dwell upon them here. To every action there is a reaction, and what was by way of exception becomes frequent and general under the ʻAbbāsids. True there was Rajā' ibn Ḥaiwah, the Mawlā of Kindah, much respected and revered by the Omayyads,[2] but the general Arab feeling towards them is

[1] Mas'ūdī, Vol. VI, p. 59; Ṭabarī, 2, 1960; Fakhri, p. 163; Wellhausen, p. 314.

[2] De Goeje, Vol. I, p. 90.

reflected in the contemporary Arab poetry and in an incident related of Omar Ibn 'Abdi-l-'Aziz. He appointed a Mawlā the Governor of Wādi-l-Qurā. On being reproached for it, said the Caliph, "he reads the book of God and knows tradition, has not our Prophet said: By this Qur'ān God elevates one and abases another." One more story of the pious Omar might be mentioned. Ziyād Ibn Abī Ziyād, a Mawlā of Abū Rabī'ah, came to visit him. Omar, thereupon, moved away from the front seat saying, "When a person comes, over whom you know that you possess no superiority, do not deprive him of the seat of honour."[1] But Omar's conduct is not the general standard of Omayyad morality. Pious and god-fearing he stands in splendid isolation among the Omayyad sovereigns.

The fact that Suyūṭī expressly mentions Manṣūr as the first who employed Mawālī in offices of trust and gave them precedence over the Arabs sufficiently indicates their social and political status till the time of that 'Ābbāsid Caliph.[2] The non-Arab Muslims and the Mawālī who had, during the Omayyad period, dared to put forward their claim to equality with the full-blooded Arabs, only in a modest and tentative manner, now appear on the scene as a definite party, the Shu-'ūbiyyah or "partisans of the gentiles". Starting with the proposition that all Muslims were equal, they proceeded to the length of declaring the Arab inferior to many other races. Already under Manṣūr, says Goldziher, we are witnesses of how the Arab waits vainly for entrance before the Caliph's gate, while men of Khurāsān go freely in and out, and mock the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

[2] Tāriḵhu-l-Khulafā, p. 22.

rude Arab. The poet Abū Tammān (d. A.D. 845-46) was rebuked by the Vazir, because he had compared the Caliph to Ḥātim of Ṭayy and other personages in whom the Arabs gloried, with the words "Dost thou compare the Commander of the Faithful with these barbarous Arabs?"

Of these Shu'ūbiyyah, says Professor Browne, each one vaunted particularly the claims to distinction of his own nationality, whether Syrian, Nabathæan, Egyptian, Greek, Spanish or Persian, but the last named were at once the most vehement and the most numerous.[1] A vast literature has arisen upon this subject; an account of it will be found on p. 268 of Professor Browne's invaluable history of Persian Literature.

It seems that at the time when Ibn Qutaibah and Al-Jāḥiḍh lived (in the third century of the A.H.), the literary feud between the supporters of the Arab supremacy and their opponents was carried on on a far greater scale than the remains of this literature would lead us to suppose. We find an echo, as it were, of this movement in Al-Bīrūnī, who lived in the fourth century of the Hegira, wrote in Arabic and championed the cause of the Persian race against the idle boasts of the friends of the Arabs, particularly Ibn Qutaibah. Even the religious sectarians did not fail to make use of this intellectual movement. At the end of the third century of the Hegira we find the Karmathian

[1] P. 226; Goldziher, Vol. I, pp. 147-208; Brockelmann, p. 140. I have translated, in Appendix III, the chapter from the 'Iqd of Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, which gives us almost all the arguments used by the Shu'ūbiyyah party, in support of their claim to superiority over the Arabs. I need not repeat them here.

Propaganda in the south of Persia, combining their religious and political teachings with the doctrine that 'God favours not the Arabs since they killed Al-Ḥusain. He prefers the subjects of the Chosroes and their descendants, since they alone held out for the right of the Imāms to the Caliphate' : a doctrine which was taught to the initiated among the followers of the Ismā'īliyyah, of whom these Karmathians formed but a branch. According to Akhū Muḥsin this doctrine was taught to the initiated when he reached the ninth stage in the initiation of the mysteries of the sect.

This party received support and encouragement from the 'Abbāsid Caliphs themselves, who readily lent themselves alike to Persian habits and customs and the Persian current of thoughts and ideas. Ma'mūn appointed three directors of the House of Wisdom founded by him ; one of these was a great opponent of the Arabs.[1]

Mu'taṣim, favouring the foreigners, showed an open dislike to the Arabs. He ordered all the Arabs to be struck off from the military register of Egypt and ordered their annuity to be stopped.[2] Under Mutawakkil all the regular troops were given light brown cloaks and were required to wear their swords, according to the Persian fashion, buckled around the waist. The Arabs, on the contrary, wore their swords slung from the shoulder.[3]

It stands in glaring contrast to the conduct of Yazid Ibn Muhallab, who caused an Arab to be punished

[1] Fihrist, p. 120; Z.D.M.G., p. 628; year 1859.
[2] Ibn Taghrybardy, Vol. I, p. 642.
[3] Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 237.

because he had dared to show himself in an elegant Persian dress. One more instance and we shall have done. When the Turkish party wanted to compel the Caliph Muhtadī to resign the Caliphate, the people of Baghdād and the Arab troops stood up for him. They desired that the old military organization, as it existed under Musta'in, should be once more restored; that the pay of the soldiers should be paid every two months, and that the fiefs and lands, improperly bestowed upon the Turkish officers, should be taken back for the benefit of the treasury. Finally they demanded that *the Caliph should entrust the supreme command of the army to one of his relatives* (*consequently to an Arab*), *and take it away from the Turkish clients and soldiery.*[1]

These facts are an eloquent commentary upon the politics of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate. It is not astonishing, then, that the Shu'ūbiyyah should openly wage war with the Arab supremacy, that the Turkish soldiery should reduce the Caliphate to a mere phantom of its former self, that the distant Governors should lop off province after province from the Empire of the Caliphate, owing but a shadowy allegiance to the Commander of the Faithful, that the bond of unity and cohesion, so strong and powerful in the earlier periods of the Caliphate, should loosen and finally dissolve, and that the Moguls should swoop down and break up the already disjointed Empire of the Caliphate of Baghdād, and wipe out its existence for evermore. The main cause of the fall of the Omayyads and the 'Abbāsids was precisely the same. It is to be sought in the official tyranny and

[1] Ibn Khaldūn, General History, Vol. III, p. 229, *apud* Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 238.

corruption, unbounded luxury and license,[1] a complete dereliction of the duties which a government owes to its subjects, and a total disregard of everything that is just and righteous.[2]

[1] We can form some idea of the luxury, at the time of the 'Abbāsids, from what Qādhī Aḥmad Ibn Kāmil, the companion of Abū Ja'far aṭ-Ṭabarī, says of Khālid B. Yazīd B. Mazyad (belonging to a famous family of generals). Qādhī Aḥmad says that his house was sold, in the reign of Muṭī, when Baghdād and the Caliphate had fallen on evil times, for 10,000 Dirhams. He observes that if the nails alone, which were used in that house, were sold for that amount, the sale would have been at a loss like the sale of stolen goods. There was within this building a large mosque for the servants and attendants to pray in, and within its premises there were more than 100 wells. (Ibn Ḥazm Jamharatu-n-Nasab, Folio A 112 [last line] MS., Khuda Bukhsh's Oriental Public Library, Bankipore. This valuable manuscript is a necessary companion to Ibn Duraid's Kitābu-l-Ishtiqāq.)

[2] When Naṣr (the Omayyad Governor of Khurāsān) fled at the news of the approach of Qaḥṭabah, he went to Nubātah (this man was sent by the Governor of 'Irāq with reinforcements to Naṣr), then at Jurjān, and joined forces with him. Qaḥṭabah then marched against them, his son Al-Ḥasan being in charge of the vanguard. When Naṣr and Nubātah were informed of the advance of Qaḥṭabah against Jurjān, they dug a trench round the city. On his arrival Qaḥṭabah took his quarters in front of them, but when his followers saw how well the people of Syria were equipped, they were seized with fear and spoke with each other about it. Qaḥṭabah coming to know of this, stood up and addressed his troops thus :

"*O People of Khurāsān, this country belonged of old to your own ancestors and God always gave victory unto them over their enemies on account of their justice and righteous conduct. But on their changing their mode of life and oppressing [people] God was wrath with them and deprived them of their rule and gave power over them to the meanest of nations, i.e., the Arabs who conquered their country, married their women, took their children captives and killed their fathers. These Arabs, however, at first acted with justice, fulfilled their promises and helped the oppressed. Then they altered [their course of conduct] and disregarded justice in their administration and struck terror in the hearts of the family of the Prophet, the custodians of the faith. So God has now given them into your hands;*" and at the conclusion of his address he said : "*O People fight for victory, for verily you are fighting men who have burnt the 'Bait ullah. (The House of God, i.e., the Ka'bah).*" This speech inspired courage in them and strengthened their spirit. De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, pp. 192-193.

While the Omayyads lost their power by a policy of exclusiveness, aristocratic pride and aggressive imperialism, the 'Abbāsids lost theirs by an excessive pliableness, yielding at first to foreign influences and then to foreign soldiery. The decline of the Omayyads and the 'Abbāsids merely exemplifies the first principle of political science—that no government can subsist, however strongly backed by military strength, without the loyalty, devotion and genuine support of its subjects.

It remains for me gratefully to acknowledge the assistance I have received in my work. I here tender my sincere thanks to Sir Charles Lyall, Professor Margoliouth, Mr. Justice Ameer Ali and Mr. H. F. Samman. Had it not been for their ungrudging assistance, this volume most probably would never have seen the light. The present writer, however, would be wanting in gratitude if he were to fail to mention that he is particularly beholden to Dr. Denison Ross, Ph.D., from whom he has received uniform kindness and courtesy, invaluable advice, sympathetic encouragement and liberal assistance in all his literary and historical work. To Mr. R. F. Azoo, Arabic Instructor to the Board of Examiners, the present writer is obliged for the transliteration of Arabic words.

BAR LIBRARY, S. K. B.
Calcutta, 18th October, 1904.

ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION

I HAD an idea of placing at the end of the 'Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams' a select number of important texts relating to the history and civilization of Islam. I intended, chiefly, to collect those texts which deal with the influence of foreign culture on the religion and morals of the Arabs. But during the process of selection, the notices which I had drawn from various sources grew into a sort of picture which I found so fascinating that I resolved to complete it as an independent work, which, though meant for a small circle of fellow-orientalists, would for all purposes be of greater value than a dry collection of oriental texts.

The present work is closely connected with my earlier ones, since it extends and completes them in many points. Little would I be ashamed of openly confessing and retracting, if the opinions formed by me had proved unsound in the course of my studies. But scarcely in any case am I driven to that course. On the contrary, much has been still more convincingly confirmed.

Not a little, however, still remains to be carefully inquired into. To understand Islam as well as the political system which has been founded upon it, and which for more than a millennium has been the basis of Mohammedan society, we must, as in all branches of science, apply the analytical and comparative methods.

The edifice of Islam was reared upon the ruins of the earlier civilizations. It incorporated old elements into itself, partly transforming them, and added new things of its own creation. To separate and arrange these various constituent elements and to trace and appreciate their inner relations and connections with each other is the task of the free and unprejudiced science which has only one watch-word : Truth !

But in the study of oriental religions and civilizations, it is far more difficult than appears at the first glance to distinguish the, at times, absolutely heterogeneous elements which are found existing side by side, covering and at time seriously altering each other, and to obtain a clear idea of their origin.

Western Asia has always been exceedingly fertile in religious innovations. There arose the four great religions, and from that very soil sprang countless religious sects, philosophic systems and religious doctrines. From there started and took their world-historical course the four powerful waves of religious ideas; those of Judaism, Parsiism, Christianity and Islam, which have stirred human thoughts and feelings to their depths.

And it is a singular fact, apparently indicating the appearance of a well-arranged scheme and regularity, that these religions should have arisen one after another at certain intervals. (Moses 1500 years before Christ, Zoroaster about 600 years before Christ and Mohammed about 600 years after Christ.) But as on the open sea, in between two waves a constantly changing struggle of small whirlpools is formed, so indeed the space of time between the appearance of two religions is filled up with countless religious innovations, of which some are fair,

fresh and vigorous; others ruinous, bearing within them germs of decay and dissolution.

Of these young offshoots some perished in course of time; others throve and transmitted their seed to subsequent generations.

Thus we are able to point, in many regions of Eastern civilization, to two or even several strata, laid one over another; or else so thoroughly combined and united as to present the appearance, in a certain measure, of one compact whole.

These combinations are all the more easily effected, since all the great Asiatic religions exhibit a certain continuity of form, a certain family resemblance which have long been observed, and which indeed suggested to an Arab geographer the idea that apparently only under the temperate zone of Western Asia could the founders of religions have been developed.

We are almost inclined to accede to the proposition that the physical character of Northern Arabia, Palestine, Mesopotamia and the Persian plateau, which is essentially identical, may have found its expression in the intellectual capacity and especially in the religious sentiment of the inhabitants of those countries. One and the same local colouring not only belongs to these countries, but can be discerned in their intellectual creations. Many things in the sacred books of the Parsis remind us of the Bible, and the same notes are struck in the Christian scriptures as in the Qur'ān.

When one enters the desert for the first time, whether it is the Arabian desert, coming if one does from Egypt, or the Syro-Mesopotamian plain, coming if one

does from Syria across Palmyra, the first impression that one obtains is that of a surprising monotony of colour. The land, the vegetable world, the animals, even the men, all have received from the fine dust of the unstable sand a yellow-ochre hue which dazzles the eye in the blaze of a scorching sun. The deep-yellow hide of the gazelle, which flits about the sandwaves, is in perfect harmony with the colour of the soil, and at times it is difficult to distinguish one from the other. The same is the case with the camel and its plumed half-brother, the ostrich. The few briars and dwarfish trees look withered and dust-laden, and the genuine Bedouin's skin and dress harmonize so completely with his surroundings, that to an untrained and unaccustomed eye, even from a small distance, he is scarcely distinguishable from the soil. But just as the physical conditions and the character of the inhabitants of these lands bear a striking similarity, so indeed does this similarity extend beyond things material and may be observed in matters ethical and intellectual. It is not to be explained away, however, as the result of similar origin or similar physical conditions, but is rather to be attributed to a thousand years of intercourse and exchange of ideas between the Semites and the Aryan tribes of Western Asia.

This makes the examination of the individual systems of religion and the separation of those elements, which are peculiar to each, from those which are mere foreign additions, all the more difficult.

A priori theories (like that which even now would demonstrate the unity of all religions, and point to the Vedas as their oldest document), as we need scarcely show, are of as little use to science as the now fashionable

glorification of the Aryans or the equally untenable doctrine of the original monotheism of the Semites.[1]

Before we can rise to such generalizations we must carry on lengthy and wearisome investigations on special points. Step by step, by scientific enquiries, the road must be made, that we may reach sure ground at last. Above all, the comparative method must be employed. Islam, the religion of the prophet of Mekka, offers relatively the least difficulty. It is the youngest and, as regards its origin, has the best accredited documents; so that we are enabled to follow up step by step the history of its rise and growth. Islam has largely drawn upon Judaism, Christianity, the religion of Zoroaster, and possibly even from Manichaeism. From Parsiism it has taken both directly and indirectly. A number of obviously Parsi ideas have penetrated into Islam through the channel of Jewish books, notably the Talmud. The doctrine of the resurrection, most of the legends relating to Heaven and Hell, and the entire system of demonology have found their way into the Qur'ān through Judaism. So, indeed, did the description of the trial and the tortures of the dead in the grave by two angels, *Munkar* and *Nakīr*. The idea of the Bridge Sirāṭ, as thin as a hair, which leads to Paradise across the abyss of Hell, is certainly derived from the Parsis, having passed over into the Qur'ān through the Midrash.[2] But Islam has not hesitated to borrow directly from Parsiism. It is a significant fact that the word *Dīn*, which so repeatedly

1 See Robertson Smith's First lecture in his 'Religion of the Semites'. *Ibid.*, pp. 48 *et seq.*—*Tr.*

2 These statements must, in the present state of knowledge, be received with caution.—*Tr.*

occurs in the Qur'ān, has been borrowed from the Parsi books. In the Huzvaresh it appears in exactly the same form (old Bactrian Dæna.)[1]

With regard to the ritual, this much is clear that the entire ceremonies relating to the pilgrimage and the sacred service at the Temple of Mekka have survived in Islam, with little or no variation, from the days of Arab heathenism.[2]

1 With justice Haneburg observes in his careful monograph 'Kriegsrecht der Moslimen' that hitherto the influence of Parsiism on Islam has not been justly estimated.

2 Special mention should here be made of the animals for sacrifice which, adorned with flowers, the pilgrims used to bring with them to slay at the close of the pilgrimage. That the blackstone at the Ka'bah is no more than the old tribal fetish of the Quraish, the saying of Omar, as he kissed it, proves: "By God! I know that thou art a stone and thou canst neither injure nor do me any good. Had I not seen the prophet of God touch thee, I would assuredly not have touched thee." Bukhari (on Pilgrimage). [The following passage from Sir Richard Burton's Pilgrimage to Al-madina and Mekka will be interesting: Vol. II, pp. 301, 392. "Wilford (As. Soc., Vols. III and IV) makes the Hindus declare that the blackstone at Mokshesha or Mokshasthana (Mekka) was an incarnation of *Shiva* who with his Consort visited Al-Hijaz. When the Ka'bah was rebuilt, this emblem was placed in the outer wall for contempt, but the people still respected it. In the Dabistan the blackstone is said to be an image of Kaywan or Saturn; and Shahrāstāni also declares the temple to have been dedicated to the same planet *Zuhal* whose genius is represented in the *Puranas* as fierce, hideous, four-armed and habited in a black coat, with a dark turband. Muslim historians are unanimous in asserting that Sasan, son of Babegan, and other Persian monarchs, gave rich presents to the Ka'bah; they especially mention two golden crescent moons, a significant offering. The Guebers assert that among the images and relics left by Mahabad and his successors in the Ka'bah, was the blackstone, an emblem of Saturn. They also call the city of Mahgah—moon's place—from an exceedingly beautiful image of the moon; whence they say the Arab derived "Mekka". And the Sabæans equally respect the Ka'bah and the pyramids which they assert to be the tombs of Seth, Enoch (or Hermes), and Sabi, the son of Enoch. Mekka, then, is claimed as a sacred place, and the Hajar al-Aswad, as well as the Ka'bah, are revered as holy emblems by four different faiths—the Hindus, Sabæans, Gueber, and Muslim."—*Tr.*]

The entire service at the mosque of Mekka is now just as it was 1500 years ago. Conformably to the heathen conception, the inhabitants of Mekka look upon themselves as the servants of the sanctuary. "We are children of the sun and the servants of the sanctuary" (Naḥnu aulādu-shams wa khaddāmīna-l-ḥaram), said to me a little time ago, a Mekkan who travelled with me from Beyrut to Egypt on the same ship. The pilgrimage to the Temple of Mekka, as is well known, has its origin in remote antiquity. People visiting the Ka'bah, in accordance with the heathen custom, had to appear naked. Even women formed no exception to it, and naked indeed had the pilgrims to perform seven rounds round the Ka'bah. The Quraish alone had had the prerogative of keeping on and lending dress to foreign pilgrims, and out of this was developed a very lucrative trade.[1]

[1] In Bukhārī's collection of traditions the tradition runs as follows: Farwah Ibn Abi-l-Maghrā on the authority of Alī Ibn Mushir; he on the authority of Hishām Ibn 'Urwah. 'Urwah relates: "The pilgrims, in heathen days, used to perform naked the rounds round the Ka'bah. The exception to this rule were the *Hums*. The *Hums* were the Quraish and their decendants; the *Hums* made a trade of it, since men lent clothes to foreign male pilgrims and women, to foreign female pilgrims, that in them they might perform the round. If the *Hums* did not give any dress to foreign pilgrims, they had to perform the rounds naked." Bukhārī: "The Book of Pilgrimage." (Krehl's Ed., Vol. I, p. 420. *Tr.*). The 'Urwah here mentioned, on whose authority the tradition is handed down, was one of the seven jurists of Medina and was recognized as a very trustworthy traditionist. Nawawī Tahdhīb Ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 420. The same is the case with Ali Ibn Mushir. [' Urwah died in A. H. 94, which was called ' the year of the jurists ' owing to the deaths of a large number of jurists that year. De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab., Vol. I, p. 8. We have a further confirmation of this fact in Ibn Ḥazm, MS. Folio 84a, line 3. The translation runs thus: "Iyādh Ibn Himār was a friend of the Prophet in the Days of Ignorance," and his Ḥaramī. Ḥaramī was one who had a friend among the Quraish and who used to make the circuit round the Ka'bah with his clothes on. *Those not having friends among the Quraish made the circuit*

The only change that Mohammed introduced was to allow the pilgrims to put on a particular pilgrim dress consisting of two pieces of cloth, of which one covers the hip and the other the breast and shoulders, while the head has to be kept uncovered, as in ancient days, when they used to make up their hair into a sort of wig by means of some glutinous substance. And so indeed it has remained to this day the prescribed pilgrim costume. After visiting the Ka'bah, they used, in heathen days, to visit the two rocky hills of Safā and Marwah on which were placed two bronze idols. Mohammed went so far in his toleration of the heathen

naked. Quraish: Upon the derivation of this name opinion is divided: According to some Quraish ibn Badr or Quraish ibn Yakhlud was the leader of the Caravan of Kinanah on their commercial journeys, and people used to say: there come the camels of Quraish so that the whole tribe is said to have been, accordingly, called after him. According to others the tribe received the name because he used to collect the wares for sale from all sides (*taqarrasha*). There is yet another opinion that Qusayy was first called Quraish along with his other title Al-Mujammi, 'the Collector,' since he collected his tribesmen in order to strengthen his rule over Mekka which he had wrung from the Yamanite tribes, so that the name Quraish is even applied to Fihr, for among the Quraish' are reckoned all the Arab tribes tracing their descent from Fihr. Mas'ūdī, of the various ramifications of this family, distinguishes twenty-five families, of which he mentions 15 as aristocrats who inhabited the principal part of Mekka, Al-Biṭaḥ, where lies the Ka'bah, from Ar-Radm to Al-Ḥamaṭī to the right, so that Aṣ-Ṣafa remained excluded from it. The heads of these fifteen families were: Hashim ibn 'Abd-Manāf, al-Muṭṭalib ibn 'Abd-Manāf, al-Ḥārith ibn 'Abdi-l-Muṭṭalib, Umayyah ibn 'Abd-Shams, Naufal ibn 'Abd-Manāf, al-Ḥārith ibn Fihr, Asad ibn 'Abdi-l-Uzzā, 'Abdu-d-Dār ibn Quṣayy, Zuhrah ibn Kilāb, Taim ibn Murrah, Malehzūm, Yaqadhah ibn Murrah, 'Adiyy ibn Ka'b, Sahm and Jumaḥ. The ten of humbler station in life were those who inhabited the portion of the town situated at an elevation and in the banlieus of al-d-hawāhir. They were: Mālik ibn H'isl, Ma'īṣ ibn 'Amir, Munqidh ibn 'Amir, Nizār ibn 'Amir, Sāmah ibn Lu'ayy, Taimal-Adram Muḥārib ibn Fihr, al Ḥarith-ibn 'Abdi-llāh ibn Kinānah, 'Aidhah, *i.e.*, Khuzaimah ibn Lu'ayy and Bunānae, *i.e.*, Sa'd ibn Lu'ayy. Wüstenfeld, Geneal. Tabellen, pp. 139-40.—*Tr.*

pilgrimage customs that he suffered the visit to Safā and Marwah to continue as before, but he had the idols removed.[1] Of the history of the origin of the forms of the prayer, prostration, ablution and fasts our knowledge is vague, uncertain and shadowy.[2]

The 'Ashūrā' day[3] was a fast day even before Mohammed, but the fast of Ramaḍhān seems to be an imitation of the Christian Lent; while the ablution and prostration appear to be an importation from a Judæo-Christian sect or from the Manichaeans.[4] Just as the founder of the Arab religion drew upon various sources,

[1] Muwaṭṭā, Vol. II, pp. 219, 674; Bukhārī (The Book of Pilgrimage); *cf.* Sprenger, Das Leben Moh., Vol. II, p. 9.

[2] See Appendix No. IV.

[3] *Cf.* Sprenger, Das Leben Moh., Vol. III, p. 54.

[When the Prophet arrived at Medina (see Krehl, Moh., pp. 136-7) he found the Jews fasting on the day of 'Ashūrā.' They were questioned about it, and they said it was the day on which God gave victory to Moses and the Israelites over Pharoah. Accordingly we fast in honour of it. Then the Prophet said: We are more closely related to Moses than you, and ordered the day of 'Ashūrā' to be observed as a fast day. Bukhārī, Vol. III, p. 51. *Krehl's* Ed.—*Tr.*]

[4] It scarcely admits of a doubt that Mohammed knew Christianity only in that form in which it existed among the sects of the Ebionites and the Nazarenes who lived in the country east of the Jordan, *e.g.*, (Balqā' Ḥarrān). Singularly enough the word masjid (mosque), which occurs in the Qur'ān, has been found on the inscriptions which were discovered in Ḥrrān and indeed inscriptions of Pre-Islamite times. It is very probable that Mohammed, who possibly visited Bostra, borrowed the word as well as the ritual and formalities from one and the same source [see the translator's paper "The mediæval conception of Islam"]. The expression Jāmi' (chief mosque) is a translation of the Greek word *Synagoge* and occurs only in later times. In the Qur'ān it is not found, on the contrary; the word *masjid* is not borrowed from Judaism, as is clear from the meaning of the root, which in Hebrew means "the worship of idol." ["This argument," says Prof. Margoliouth, "is unsatisfactory. In the Jewish paraphrase of the Bible the word is used of prostration before the true God also."—*Tr.*] The word could only have come into use in a sect in which prayer was accompanied by prostra-

so did Islam carry on this process of borrowing on a still larger scale, during the period of its crystallisation which set in after the death of Mohammed. For instance, the legend of Mohammed's Journey to Heaven, which is scarcely more than hinted at in the Qur'ān, was given a poetical colouring in the first century of the Hejira and gradually became a constituent element of the Mohammedan catechism. The whole legend is modelled upon one of the Christian apocryphal writings "the Journey to Heaven of the Prophet Isaiah," which arose during the persecution of the Christians under the Emperor Nero.[1]

From Parsiism probably came, through Jewish channels, the tradition which says that on the day of resurrection death, personified in the shape of a ram, will be slain, and thenceforward man will enjoy eternal life. In all probability this idea is an imitation of the

tion (sujūd). This is the case not only with the Manichaeans but also with the Native Christians of Syria whom we can see to this day, kneeling down before the altar as they enter the church then prostrating themselves so that their head touches the ground—a process which is scarcely distinguishable from the Mohammedan sujūd. In Arabia sujūd was not in fashion, and the false prophet Ṭulaiḥah ridiculed it and commanded the prayer to be offered in a standing posture. (Bilādhuri, p. 97.) Recent investigations have confirmed Sprenger's opinion that the land east of the Jordan was the seat of those ideas which have given birth to Islam. [The ablution was in use in pagan South Arabia: see D. H. Müller, Hungarische Alterthümer, K. K. Museum, Wien.—*Tr.*]

[1] See Sūrah XVII, Qur'ān. For its subsequent embellishments see Ibn Hishām, Vol. I, pp. 168 *et seq.*, *Bukharī*, Vol. III, pp. 30 *et seq.* (*Krehl's* Ed.); Krehl, Das Leben Moh., pp. 120-124. 'The whole vision, in its details, reminds us very forcibly indeed of the Pre-Christian Book of Enoch, which was known and much read throughout the East. It is not at all improbable that the *vision* owes its existence to the influence of the Jews who knew this book.' Krehl, p. 124.—*Tr.*

Parsi legend of the bull of *Hadhayaos* which occurs in the Talmud.*

But not merely in the religious sphere foreign influences are perceptible, but they have specially left their abiding impress on the civic life and political institutions of the Muslims; though the Arab mind did not fail to assert its independence and display its creative genius. Such is Omar's communistic-democratic system of politics founded upon the basis of theocracy—one of the most remarkable phenomena of history. The whole of antiquity has nothing to show which could be compared with it.

All Muslims were to enjoy perfect equality of rights; the entire State income as well as the conquered lands were to be the common property of the Muslim community, and every member of the brotherhood of Islam was to receive a fixed annuity from the State chest. On the other hand, the Arabs were not permitted to acquire landed property or carry on agriculture.† They were to form a military caste for whom the subject races were bound to cultivate land and supply provisions.

But in spite of Omar's political originality and independence he accepted and adopted, for every single department of government, a number of Persian and

* In the Talmud it is related that on the day of resurrection a bull will be slain and given as food to the pious. *Cf.* Z.D.M.G. XXXI, p. 583. Ghazzālī adduces a tradition in his Iḥyā', according to which the prophet is alleged to have said: "On the day of resurrection death will be brought in the form of a white ram and slain." Iḥyā', p. 28, Vol. IV. In Bukhārī it is simply said that death will be slain between Paradise and Hell. With this agrees 1 Cor. 15, 26. *Cf.* Baur: Dogmengesch., Vol. I, p. 647.

† This is not altogether correct. Wellhausen, Das Arab. Reich., pp. 168, *et seq.*—*Tr.* [Appendix 1.]

Byzantine institutions, *e.g.*, the system of coinage, the administrative division of the provinces, the system of taxation (Jizyah, *tributum capitis*, Khirāj, *tributum soli*).

The property-tax, known also as poor-tax, because originally the revenue from this source was divided among poor Muslims (Ṣadaqah, Zakāt, ' Ushr), is an institution which existed even in the remotest antiquity among the Canaanites, the Phœnicians, and the Carthaginians as temple-tax for the benefit of the priests. Moreover, the first two words (Ṣadaqah and Zakāt) have been borrowed from the Jewish vocabulary. Even the word to denote Board of Taxes, which later on was extended to all the Government offices, the word *Dīwān** is Aramaic, since Omar allowed this institution, which he found existing in conquered countries, to continue undisturbed and indeed turned it to his advantage.

In military matters the Arabs very largely borrowed from the foreigners, but, to be sure, after Omar. In the beginning their mode of warfare was exactly like that of the Bedouin tribes, but very soon they learned the advantages of a better military organization.

The Omayyad Caliphs appear to have given their special attention to this subject, and adopted the more important principles of Roman warfare, which they had learnt in their wars with the Byzantines. Early indeed the system of permanent camps is introduced. Just like the Romans, the Arab generals begin to pitch their camps after every day's march with ramparts

* This etymology is impossible. Lagarde, Gesamm. Abhandlungen, p. 216, compares various Iranian words.—*Tr.*

and ditches and two or four gates. Originally the Arabs fought in lines, later on in a compact body of troops (Kardūs).

Originally the Arab troops were arranged according to their respective tribes ; later on, they were formed into independent corps. At the head of every ten men was placed an ' *Arīf* (Decurio) ; every fifty, a *Khalīfah* ; and every hundred, a *Qā'id* (Centurio). The earliest mode of arranging the army was in centre, right and left wing ; later on were added the front and the rear-guard. Roman influence is shown still more clearly in the machines which were used by the Arabs at a siege ; these were the Ballista and Catapults (Manjanīq, ' Arrādah), the battering-ram for making a breach in the wall (Kabsh, aries) ; the tortoise for undermining ramparts (Dabbābah, testudo = an engine of war under cover of which the besieging soldiers approached a town).

Since I intend discussing exhaustively elsewhere the military system of the Caliphate I refrain from going, with any detail, into this subject in the present work.

I have referred to this subject to draw attention to the facts and to show what a rich harvest for research lies in this field.

We must some day deal, thoroughly and dispassionately, with the facts which reveal to us the history of the civilization of Islam.

By that method alone shall we be able to obtain certainty about so many fascinating and instructive questions. We must, indeed, endeavour to raise our science to the same level as the geologist has raised his,

who, in spite of all the dislocation of the strata, can fix with certainty that this deposit belongs to the chalk formation and that to the granite period, or the philologist who can distinguish with perfect precision the native from the foreign elements of a language.

The history of the religion and civilization of Islam, as soon as we are able to distinguish the indigenous from the foreign elements in it, will offer to us quite a different and indeed a more accurate perspective than has been the case hitherto.

Thus I have chiefly investigated those particulars of Islamic history in which foreign influences have made themselves felt and where the remains of older civilizations are traceable, though dimly, through the dust of ages.

In this way there has come into being a sort of mosaic work, though indeed the picture which I have sought to draw on the narrow canvas of this treatise is, in many respects, far from being absolutely complete.

I have confined myself to the period of the Caliphate and have endeavoured to describe not merely some of the important religious, but also social, changes which took place under the influences of foreign ideas.

The history of the rise of the Qur'ān has already been ably discussed by Dr. Sprenger; so that I would not here put forward my own views on that question: but the hint just thrown out suffices to indicate that this subject has not yet been completely exhausted, and that a rich harvest might still be reaped by a comparative study of the Jewish and Parsi books, the literature of the first centuries of the Christian era, and the study of the histories of the Jewish and Christian sects.

My subject now is, as is likely to be for a long time, the Caliphate from its rise to its fall, and I may be permitted to hope that by means of such a monograph, meant indeed for a narrow circle of *savants*, interest in this sphere of oriental life would be awakened and accurate knowledge of that period promoted.

It scarcely needs proof that the entire political history of Islam must necessarily remain obscure and unintelligible so long as it is kept apart from the history of its civilization.

A. V. K.

Islam had, in its first outburst, led numerous hordes of Arab tribes through the desert, which forms the Northern and Eastern boundaries of Arabia, on to Syria and the lands along the Euphrates. Love of booty and conquest united these rude tribes in concerted action, and within a short space of time Syria and Babylon fell at the feet of the Caliph. Both these countries were inhabited by people, who, since remotest antiquity, had been in possession of a tolerably advanced civilization. The Arabs thus found themselves face to face with intellectual elements which were completely foreign to them and the full force of which they were then scarcely able to divine. In Syria Islam was confronted with a religious system which had been artificially developed and provided with a logical basis by a long series of dogmatic discussions and controversies. In Babylonia various cults subsisted, side by side, with that mutual toleration which was one of the best features of the old heathen religious systems. Out of the violent collision of Islam with such ancient faiths followed numerous combinations and results, and these intellectual struggles

and the transformation of ideas consequent upon them have had a profound influence on the subsequent religious history of the East.

To the untiring industry of the Arab chroniclers we owe our knowledge of the political and military history of those times which is as precise as can be expected, at a distance of twelve centuries, but the inner history of that remarkable epoch, the history of the war waged by a new and rude religion against those old and highly developed systems of religion, is scarcely known even in its barest outline. I shall therefore attempt here to discuss facts—ascertained by independent research and now for the first time brought to light—which indicate external influences on Islam and the Arab civilization, and to present them in the shape of a complete picture.

Christianity was the first system which came into close contact with Islam.

Damascus was once the residence of the Omayyad Caliphs and precisely there at that time flourished a school of theology which produced some notable teachers of the Eastern Church. In the capital of the Caliphs a lively intellectual life was developed, and manifold must have been the relations between Muslim and Christian theologians. That religious discussions between them were very frequent we might be certain; even though dialogues between Muslims and Christians had not been preserved in the writings of John of Damascus and Theodore Abucara.

It was out of these theological discussions, in all probability, that sprang up the first religious sects of Islam, *viz.*, those of the Murji'ah and the Qadariyyah.[1]

[1] [Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, p. 279; see Macdonald's Develop. of

Being given to a life of pleasure most of the Omayyad Caliphs exhibited great tolerance towards Christians and people of other faith than Islam. Christians had not merely a free entry at the Court of the Caliph, but were entrusted with the most important posts of confidence. Sergius, the father of John of Damascus, enjoyed at the Court of the Caliph 'Abdu-l-Malik, the place of first Councillor, and after his death his son was given the same post. A Christian was even the official Court poet of the Omayyads.[1]

So favourable then was the position of the Christians that they were even suffered to enter the mosques unmolested, and go about in public adorned with the golden Cross.[2] The toleration accorded to the Christians by the Caliphs must, of necessity, have encouraged frequent intercourse with Muslims. By associating with Greek theologians, finely disciplined in the art of dialectic, the Arabs first learnt philosophical reasoning, which later on they prized so highly. It was from them again that they received their first lesson in dogmatic subtleties—an art in which the Byzantine scholarship revelled.

In this way alone is to be explained the remarkable similarity which we notice in the main features of Byzantine Christianity and Islamic dogmatics.

Foremost is the enquiry into the essence and attributes of God, which fills the first place in the writings both of the Greek Fathers and of the oldest Arab theo-

Muslim Theology, p. 122 *et seq.*, Z.D.M.G., Vol. XXXII, p. 341 *et seq.*, *Ibid.*, XLII, p. 591.—*Tr.*]

[1] Al Akhṭāl, Aghānī, XIV, p. 122.

[2] Aghānī, IV, p. 182; VII, pp. 179-187.

logians. The oldest Muslim theologians, just as much as the Fathers of the Greek Church, busy themselves with discussions about fate and free-will. In opposition to the Western Church, the Fathers of the Greek Church declared themselves against the *eternity of the punishment of Hell* and the very same view was taken by the oldest theological school of Islam, known as the Murji'ah.

It is very much to be regretted that we possess so little accurate information about this sect; but it shared the fate of that epoch. The Arab histories of the time of the Omayyads have entirely perished, and the earliest history that has come down to us dates from the time of the Abbasids. For information as to the Murji'ah we are therefore driven to the scattered notices which we find in later Arab writers. The oldest fragment that deals with them is a poem which has hitherto remained unnoticed. It was composed at the time of the Caliph 'Abdu-l-Malik and runs as follows[2] :—

> O Hind,[2] it appears to me that life is nearing its end,
> And I see my existence diminishing and growing worse.
> I am pledged to a day which I cannot avoid,[3]
> If it is not to-day it is indeed near at hand.
> I have entered into a compact with God and if I keep that compact
> I will enjoy one day in paradise the company of the Martyrs of Uhud.
> O Hind, listen to me: our duty is
> To serve God and associate no companion with him.

[1] Aghānī, XIII, 52 [See Z.D.M.G., Vol. 45, p. 161. Van Vloten's paper on 'Irjā.—*Tr.*]

[2] Probably the wife or the beloved of the poet is here addressed.

[3] The day of his death.

We postpone the solution of doubtful questions,
And speak truly about those who have done wrong and were refractory.[1]
We reckon all Muslims as members of the community of Islam.[2]
And all unbelievers are equal to whatever sect they may belong.
I do not consider that a sin
Makes any one a polytheist[3] if he professes belief in the oneness of the Eternal (God).
We shed not blood unless others intend to shed ours;
This is our avowed belief.
And he who fears God on Earth for him there will be the reward of the God-fearing,
When hereafter he comes to the reckoning,
And what God has ordained in the world,
That is indeed not to be evaded and whatever
He ordains, that is right.
All the Khārijites err in their assertions,
However devout and earnest they assert themselves to be,
But 'Alī and Othmān verily both servants of God who had associated no companion
With the Almighty since He was worshipped.
Between them there was a dispute and they were present at the breach of the peace;
And God knows what was happening in their presence,
'Alī and Othmān are to be judged according to their works
And I know not if they have acted according to the precepts of the Qur'ān.
God knows, what kind of deeds they have done,
For every servant will one day stand alone before God.

[1] *I.e.*, those who rose against the third Caliph Othmān.

[2] In opposition to the Khārijites who look upon others than Khārijites as unbelievers.

[3] In opposition to the Khārijites who declare every Muslim unfaithful who has committed a great sin. [See Browne, p. 280; Appendix II, Translator.]

The contents of this document,[1] the oldest and hitherto an unknown piece of information about the Murji'ah, is in complete accordance with what we knew already about their views from later authors.[2] They looked upon this life as well as the future with more hope and confidence than the old and genuine orthodox party and the fanatical Khārijites. In particular they denied the *eternity of the punishment of Hell* for believing Muslims. And in this doctrine of theirs we find a striking agreement with that of the Greek Fathers; for, as is known, in the Eastern Church a strong current set in, at an early period, against the opinion of the Western theologians as to the *eternity of the punishment of Hell.*

Origen held firmly by the opinion of the *finality of the punishment of Hell*, and on this point all the Alexandrians are at one with him. And even the teachers of the Church of Antioch: Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, though not of the same opinion as Origen generally in other matters, shared with him his conviction on this matter. They, likewise, disputed the *eternity of the punishment of Hell.* A further point of agreement between the Greek Church and Islam is to be found in the fact that, like the Greek Church, Islam

[1] The author of this poem is called Thabit Quṭnah and some account of his life will be found in Ibn Khaldūn's General History, Vol. III, pp. 52-56; comp. Biladhuri, p. 429; Ibn Athir, Vol. V, pp. 66, 70, 71, 81, 99, 110 and 111.

[2] Shahristani, Vol. I, pp. 160 and 164, in Harbrucker's trans. In the Kitābu-l-Aghānī verses of a poet appear who had abandoned the doctrine of the Murji'ah. These verses father upon the Murji'ah ideas which fit in with the views of the Khārijites. It appears to be an intentional misrepresentation. Comp. Aghānī, Vol. VIII, p. 92.

knows nothing of purgatory.[1] The mild, cheerful and consoling belief of the Murji'ah, as opposed to the terror and awe which filled the first generation of righteous Muslims, stand in striking harmony with the teachings of John of Damascus who, at the time of the rise of this sect, was engaged in theological speculations and enjoyed a great reputation at the capital of the Omayyad Caliphs. "It is necessary," says he, "to know that God wishes all, according to His original and foregoing intention, to share in His kingdom. He created us not to punish us but, since He is benevolent, that we might be the recipients of His bounty. The sinners He punishes, for He is just.[2] Many of the views of the Murji'ah have passed over into later Islam. The Theological School of Abū Ḥanīfah, the most widely diffused, to which the majority of the Turkish Muslims belong, rests upon Murji'ah foundation. Its founder accepted the most important Murji'ah doctrines and in the oldest Arab authority is even declared a Murji'ah.[3]

Moreover, the oldest historian of religion in Arabic literature, *viz.*, Ibn Ḥazm, speaks of the Murji'ah as those who departed the least from orthodox Islam.[4] The Ḥanafites have always remained, indeed, the most tolerant and the least fanatical of the four orthodox schools. The seeds sown a thousand years ago of a noble and dignified conception of God and human destiny have

[1] [Gregory I seems to be the first who formulated the doctrine of purgatory. Ebert, Littérature du Moyen Age, Vol. I, p. 585; *cf.* Gregorovius, Gesch, der Stadt Rom., Vol. II, p. 79. Translator.]

[2] John Damas, Ed. Lequien, Vol. I, p. 198.

[3] Ibn Qutaibah, p. 301.

[4] Ibn Ḥazm, Vienna M.S.

come down, to our own times, through the storm and stress of centuries.

It is in any case a phenomenon deserving careful attention that of the two extreme theological schools of Islam, the Ḥanifites and the Ḥambalites, of which the first represents the most tolerant and the second the most bigoted and fanatical sides of Islam, the former has obtained wider and wider extension; while the latter has been steadily on the decline. When I take into account the facts here stated, I cannot refrain from expressing my belief that the ideas of the Murji'ah owe their origin and shape to the religious philosophy of the Greek Church. A complete demonstration cannot be given, because with the exception of a few fragments, the writings of the Murji'ah have almost wholly perished, and with them the material for a complete and thorough comparison of their teachings with those of the Greek Fathers.

On the other hand, another sect of early Islam gives us further points of similarity and resemblance with Christianity. I mean the sect of the Qadariyyah, the so-called free-thinkers of Islam, who later on, under the name of the Mu'tazilites, obtained a very distinguished position. There is much to suggest that the religious views of the Qadariyyah owed their origin, in no small measure, to Christian influence. Above all it is worthy of note that their speculations were mainly directed towards the nature and the attributes of the divine Being. This same tendency is to be found in the Greek theologians; with them also the enquiry into the essence of God and His attributes fills the first place. The doctrine of the freedom of will was propounded, shortly after the

Arabs had conquered Syria, by two writers of the church, both of whom lived in Damascus and in constant touch with the Arabs. I mean John of Damascus and his pupil Theodore Abucara. The opinion that God wishes only what is good and that He is the source of goodness is maintained by John with extreme emphasis.

Just as light proceeds, says he, from the sun, so goodness emanates from God. We find foreshadowed in the writings of John of Damascus [1] the doctrine of the Mu'tazilite that God can only reward or punish men according to their deeds; that He has not created mankind to destroy them or to play, according to His caprice, a cruel joke upon them. This doctrine forms the fundamental basis of the Mu'tazilite conception of God and already appears to have been accepted by the Murji'ah. Likewise the germs of many questions, which have been exhaustively dealt with by the Muslim theologians, show themselves in the writings of the Greek Fathers; and in Arab theology we even come across certain expressions which have been borrowed from the Greek. I will only mention the word ṭa'ṭīl which the Arab theologians formed for *Kenosis* occurring in patristic literature to express the idea of stripping the conception of God from all human attributes. The external form as well as the tendency of the oldest Arab Regula fidei: a small work, known under the title of Al-Fiqhu-l-Akbar, reminds us of similar tracts by the Fathers of the Church. Christian influences have further been shown to exist on the sect of the Mu'tazilīs.[2]

[1] Johannes Dam, De fide orthodoxa, Cap. XXX. Illud quoque scire opportet, Deum omnia *præscire*, sed non omnia *præfinire*.

[2] Shatistānī, Vol. I, p. 62; Ibn Ḥazm MS; Mawāquif Ed. Soerensen, p. 340. [Ghazzāli said that the root of the seventy and two branches of

We are then justified in holding the view, novel but not unfounded, that the development of the religious sects of early Islam and the dogmatic principles evolving out of them took place mainly under the influence of Christian ideas. Thus it is that there exists a direct link between the doctrines of the Murji'ah and the Qadariyyah on the one hand, and the opinions of the Greek Church as they find expression in the writings of the school of Damascus.[1]

The Mu'tazilī doctrines, which probably reach back to Damascus, the then residence of the Omayyad Caliphs, attained their greatest development pre-eminently in Basrah, Kūfah and Baghdād under the ægis of the political convulsions which transferred the centre of gravity of the Muslim Empire from Damascus to Babylon.

religion are six doctrines, namely: the Tashbih, ṭi'ṭil, Jābr, 'Qadr, Rafḍh, and Naṣb. Dabistān, Vol. II, pp. 350 *et seq.*: DeSacy, Chrest. Arabe, Vol. II, p. 96. Translator.]

[1] To support the statement that the Qadariyyah sect had its origin at Damascus I place here some dates: Ma'bad Al-Juhanī (d. 80 H.—699 A. D.) was the first to teach at Damascus the doctrine of free-will. He is said to have received this doctrine from a Persian called Senbuyeh. Hammer, Lit. Gesch, d. Araber, Vol. II, p. 153; DeSacy, Hist. des Druses, Vol. I, p. x. According to Dhahabī, in the Kitābu-l-'Ibar. Caliph 'Abdul-l-Malik caused him to be killed because he taught the doctrine of free-will. According to other accounts he was executed by Ḥajjaj. Gailan. Ibn Yūnus (d. 110 H.—728 A. D.) taught also the doctrine of free-will. He was executed by Caliph Hishām, Ibn Athir, p. 197, Vol. V. According to Dhahabi, in the Kitābu-l-'Ibar, the Caliph Yazid II professed the doctrines of the Qadariyyah. [Comp. Al Fakhrī, p. 160. It is said that the poet Maimān, surnamed A'shā who flourished during the reign of Khusrū Parwiz, and hence a contemporary of Mohammed, was a Qadarite. He is said to have received this doctrine from the 'Ibādites or the Christians of Hirah. He died in the year 6 or 7 of the Hegira. DeSacy, Chrest. Arabe, Vol. II, pp. 471-480. Translator.]

The subsequent fate of this sect, which had a profound influence on the entire intellectual activity of the Arabs, does not fall within the scope of this work. Instead of it, therefore, we will now turn to the lands along the Euphrates where Islam received from the foreign elements with which it came in contact impressions of quite a different nature.

In the beautiful lands along the Euphrates and Tigris, one of the most favoured regions of the earth, lived side by side, at the time of the Arab conquest, adherents of several faiths. The ruling Persians professed the doctrines of Zoroaster; Christianity had made considerable advance and attained predominance in certain towns; indeed, whole Bedouin tribes which had chosen Mesopotamia as their pasture ground, had gone over in a body to the fold of the Church.[1] Then there were the followers of the religion founded by Mani, a religion which was the outcome of the union of the Zoroastrian faith with Christian and Indian ideas.[2] Finally there lived many adherents of the old heathen cults, the last community of which, that of the Sabæans of Ḥarrān, survived right up to the Middle Ages. Many genuine heathen customs continued down to tolerably late times; for instance, the feast of Adonis, the divine worship of

[1] A great portion of the Rabtiah tribe, settled in Northern Mesopotamia, was Christian. 'Iqd., Vol. II, pp. 229 *et seq.*; Aghānī, XX, p. 127; also the Taghlib tribe professed Christianity. Until the time of Caliph Omar II, there were Christian Bedouins. Sirājul-l-Mulūk, fol. p. 136, Von Kremer's MSS. Also in Syria the Arab tribes Lakhim, Judham, Balqain, Bali and 'Amilah, which had settled there before Mohammed, had accepted Christianity. [Ibn Khallikān mentions Tanukh, Bahrā' and Taghlib as the three Arabian tribes which accepted Christianity, Vol. I, p. 97. Translator.]

[2] [See Prof. Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, p. 154 *et seq.* Translator.]

individual families of which we have an example even in the seventh century of the Hegira.[1]

The martial arrogance of the victorious Muslims, who treated the inhabitants of conquered lands as Helots and overburdened them with various kinds of most oppressive duties, the severe and unbending principles of the second Caliph, who absolutely prohibited the Arabs from holding and cultivating land in order to keep them as an exclusively military caste, had as its consequence here, as elsewhere, large conversions to Islam. Many of the old inhabitants of the land were sold as slaves at the conquest, and only later on, when they had professed Islam, received their freedom, by which they entered into the relation of *mawālī* or clients to their masters.

When we consider that according to the Arab conception of law the descendants of a *mawlā* or client remain in exactly the same position to the descendants of the patron as the original client was to his original master, we then perceive the rapidity of the growth of half-castes, drawn from the natives of the lands standing in the relation of clients to their Arab conquerors.

Thus grew up the ever-widening circle of Neo-Muslims. A portion of these continued to be true inwardly to their old religious convictions and only outwardly accepted Islam; but many indeed were really

[1] Gesch. d. herrsch, Ideen, p. 14. Remains of the old heathen religion continued for a long time. I wish to observe here that lamentation for the lost Adonis in its peculiar form continued till late in the Middle Ages. People used to set apart, at a certain time of the year, a day for general lamentation. Men and women of the lower class, on that day, used to strike their faces and breasts and moan the death of the son of a fairy whom they called ' Unqūd. In addition to it they sang " O mother of ' Unqūd, don't be angry with us; we did not know that ' Unqūd had died."

inspired with enthusiasm for the teachings of Islam, whose wonderful success proclaimed its truth and genuineness.

It was the common bond of this one religion which held together these various and conflicting elements. But at the first shock the link of union proved too slight and feeble, and was rent asunder.

This took place during the civil war between ʻ Ali and Muʻāwiyah. A democratic party was formed consisting mainly of genuine Arab elements hostile alike to both the competitors to the throne. Round ʻ Ali flocked a large fanatical crowd which saw in him the legitimate successor of the prophet and fastened upon him, step by step, the old Persian idea of Divine Kingship, inasmuch as they worshipped ʻ Ali and his descendants as prophets. Thus arose the extremely large religious party of the Shīʻites which became so important in the later history of the East: the extreme wing of which looked upon ʻ Ali as God; while the more moderate among them saw in his successors the legitimate high-priests of Islam in matters temporal and spiritual.[1] It would, however, be unjustifiable to ascribe only to the old oriental, perhaps, Persian ideas, the paramount influence over the origin of the Shīʻites, since we find among the first and oldest of the Shīʻites distinguished men of pure Arab descent. These became *Shīʻites*, because they, in the great struggle for the throne between Muʻāwiyah and

[1] Sayyid Ḥinyarī, a passionate Shīʻite, says in defiance of the views of the first party: " A number went too far, in their praises of ʻ Alī—may their fathers die—and in their professed love for him troubled men's souls. They say He is God—but God, our Creator, is above being son or father." [See Ibn Khall, Vol. II, p. 241, note (2); Z. D. M. G., Vol. 52, p. 466; *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 302. Tr.]

' Alī, declared themselves for the latter, in whose party as comrades they found many Persians and other foreigners whose religious opinions gradually found acceptance among them.

Thus among the oldest Arab Shī'ites we come across a belief which bears a clear and unmistakable impress of a non-Arabian cult and which cannot be considered of indigenous growth. It is the doctrine which is known in the Arab writings as the doctrine of Ar-Raj'ah, *i.e.*, the return. Belief in Ar-Raj'ah [1] or return, was, in the language of that time, tantamount to a belief that a descendant of ' Ali would arise from the dead and all men would return to life after a period not less than forty days.

This doctrine led its professors to peculiar mental aberrations, since it promoted among them an extraordinary contempt for death. An Arab Shī'ite called Khandak was so firmly convinced of Ar-Raj'ah that he assured his friends of his willingness to sacrifice his life for the common cause if only his family were provided for.[2] A friend gave him the desired assurance, and he went to Mekka and there before the assembled pilgrims he rose and began, with a loud voice, to shower reproaches upon them and accused them of having forsaken the family of the prophet who were the legitimate high-priests of Islam.[3] There were many indeed of such fanatics who

[1] Aghānī, pp. 8, 24, Vol. VII; pp. 27, 33, 34, 42, Vol. VIII.

[2] In the Kitābu-l-Aghānī, Vol. VIII, p. 33, the name Khandif is written. So also in the Vienna MS., but in Vol. XI, Cairo Ed., p. 46, we find Khandak. The latter appears to be the more correct.

[3] Kitābu-l-Aghānī, Vol. XI, p. 46. Sayyid Ḥimyarī also professed belief in the doctrine of Ar-Raj'ah as is clear from a fragment of the verse which is not found in the Kitābu-l-Aghānī, but is preserved in the 'Iqd.

believed that the Caliphate belonged to ' Ali's descendants and to them alone. These, firmly persuaded of shortly returning to life, readily courted death, and even to this day belief in Ar-Raj'ah prevails among the Shī'ites of Persia, as the history of the insurrection of the Bābīs amply shows. Among the Nuṣairīs this same religious idea has been preserved; since in their creed they apply the doctrine of Ar-Raj'ah to the ever-recurring appearance of the deity in human form. Moreover, it is related of an Arab Shī'ite, known as the poet Kuthayyir, who is reckoned among the sect of the Kaisāniyyah or Khashabiyyah (both mean the same sect), that he taught the doctrines of the transmigration of souls and the incarnation of Divinity in different forms, which doctrines indeed point to Manichæan origin.[1] The doctrine of Ar-Raj'ah or return and resurrection is of Judœo-Christian origin, as the account of Jesus' resurrection proves.

It is clear from this that belief in Ar-Raj'ah, return, was in circulation then, and possibly even earlier. According to popular belief the prophets Enoch and Elias had not died, but their living bodies were resting in their graves at Hebron. The number of forty days is found alike in Christian traditions and in these earliest sects of Islam.

In accordance with this view the earthly life of Jesus after the resurrection is fixed in the history of the Apostles at forty days (Acts I, 3; *cf.* Luke 24, 33-43). A passage in the Acts of the Apostles refers to the doctrine of Ar-Raj'ah or return, where there is a talk of the

[1] Aghānī, Vol. VIII, p. 33; *cf.* about Manichæan ideas. Neander. Allgem. Gesch. d. Chirstl. Kirche, Vol. IV, aufl. II, p. 189. Also Buddhism acknowledges a redeemer Maitrêya, who is to appear at the end of time.

rehabilitation of all things (3, 20-22). Out of it arose the idea of the millennium of the first century of the Christian era. These observations suffice to exemplify the momentous changes which came over Islam under the influence of foreign civilization. But not merely in religious matters did such influences powerfully operate, but they were still more effective in social spheres.

And the examination of this branch of the subject will now be undertaken in the following pages. It has already been pointed out how soon after the Arab conquest an extremely numerous class of Neo-Muslims had been formed by the conversion of the population of Babylonia. This half-caste stood towards the Arab conquerors in the relation of clients, the meaning of which I have elsewhere exhaustively discussed.[1] The social frame of the old Sassanian kingdom was almost entirely feudal; a large circle of hereditary nobility, the Dihqāns,[2] possessing landed property and interest constituted the link between the King and the people. This feudal nobility saved the fragments of the power still left to it, by a timely conversion to Islam, and soon obtained influence and wealth, inasmuch as it secured entirely for itself the profitable functions of collecting taxes.[3]

The influence of the Dihqāns grew to such an extent that the bigoted Caliph Omar II who, by his perverse administrative measures, brought the finances into complete disorder and indeed by it probably precipitated the fall of the Omayyad dynasty, was constrained to

[1] Biladhurī, Ed. De Goeje, p. 280.
[2] Gesch. d. Herrsch. Ideen, p. 343.
[3] Mohl. Le Livre des Rois; Introduction.

issue an order prohibiting the employment of Persians or Christians in the revenue department or in any other public capacity (Ibn Athir, p. 48, Vol. V).[1] This order, remained, however, ineffective. In early Arabic writings these Dihqāns are frequently mentioned as rich land-owners. The majority of these Dihqāns probably secured protection and influence by entering into relations of clients to one of the great generals or statesmen or a member of the ruling family. Generally foreign converts became clients of the statesman or general through whom their conversion had taken place. This practice was gradually established, and in course of time the relation of client was considered as *ipso facto* resulting from it.[2]

That the lower orders in the conquered provinces of the quondam Persian Empire became *en masse* clients is certain.[3] Thus in the new provinces the following graduated scale of castes existed :—(1) The Arab conquerors and their descendants; (2) the neo-Muslims,[4] *i.e.*, the recently converted natives and clients; (3) the non-Muslim population. The last class, if not protected by a special treaty, was well-nigh without any rights whatever (unprotected) and had to work and supply funds for the new state, specially for the support and maintenance of the army. The second class, on the contrary, in accordance with the communistic-democratic principles promulgated by Omar, according to which all

[1] *Cf.* about the annuity which Omar granted to Dihqān converts to Islam. Biladhurī, p. 457; Ibn Athīr, Vol. IV, p. 116; Vol. V, p. 167.

[2] Wellhausen has conclusively shown the unsoundness of this view. See pp. 166 *et seq.* Das Arabische Reich und Sein Sturz. [Translator.]

[3] Fihrist, p. 40.

[4] Biladhurī, p. 373; Ibn Khaldūn, Prolég, pp. 300, 302.

Muslims were equal and had an equal claim to participate in the State income, enjoyed, in theory, precisely the same rights and privileges as the full-blooded Arab. But there is no other nation, perhaps, which, like the Arabs, combined such a pronounced and distinct sense of independence with so much aristocratic consciousness and so much feeling of exclusiveness towards the foreigner. The Arab warriors and their descendants could not for an instant conceive that conversion to Islam raised a foreigner to a level of equality with the genuine-born Arab. The Arab always looked upon himself as belonging to the ruling nation which was called upon to govern the foreigners, the barbarians, the 'Ajamī. And when Mahommed in one of his sermons declared all Muslims equal and distinctions and differences of heathen days abolished, it was never within his contemplation that Islam would one day include even those who were not Arabs.[1] The subject nation might, henceforth, accept Islam, but nevertheless they were not conceded full measure of equality. The clients considered themselves all the more entitled to absolute equality with the Arabs as they devoted themselves with enthusiasm to those very learned studies which then enjoyed highest respect; namely, reading and exegesis of the Qurān, sciences of tradition and law. It almost seems that these scientific studies were, during the first two centuries of the Hegira, principally carried on by clients (Mawālī, *i.e.*, non-Arab Muslims).[2] Learned

[1] This opinion of Von Kremer is not shared by the translator. [For the Sermon of the Prophet see Krehl, Das Leben Moh, pp. 297, 380; Bukhari, Krehl's ed., p. 8; Tārikh ul khamīs, Vol. II, pp. 29 *et seq.* Tr.]

[2] *Cf.* Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, Vol. I, p. 169. Translator.

men were recruited out of their midst. The more the learned class developed, the greater became the influence of the client and all the more heavily did these circles feel their subordination to the ruling class consisting of the descendants of the conqueror.

Especially did the measures relating to landed property and taxation, on account of the inequality of burden they imposed, constitute the most dangerous source of discontent and disturbances. For the correct understanding and appreciation of the political conditions of the Caliphate and the then social situations, this subject is of such enormous importance that I feel constrained to deal here somewhat exhaustively with it. The adjustment of the relation of the old inhabitants to the conquerors and the settlement of questions relating to landed property became of vital importance, when the Arabs, after the conquest of Babylonia, found themselves in possession of one of the most beautiful and fertile portions of the earth, which was thickly populated and industriously cultivated by an agricultural population, and which indeed under the Persian rule had increased its produce tenfold by the introduction of a highly-developed system of canals and irrigation. This tract of land the Arabs call Sawād. Scarcely had they conquered it when a great dispute arose among them as to what was to be done with this land and its inhabitants.[1] The Arab troops demanded it as a booty of war

[1] Abū Yūsuf, Kitābu-l-Khiraj, p. 15; Shibi, Al Fārūq, p. 277, Part II. By Sawād the Arabs meant the entire territory which extends from the South-Eastern borders of the Syrian desert at 'Udhaīb and Qādisiyyah to the mountain chains of Hulwān, the Zagros mountain of the ancient. In breadth from East to West extending from 'Abbādān on the Persian Gulf; in length from North to South covering the territory right up to the neighbourhood of Mosul, Sawūd embraces not only Babylonia and Chaldea but

and claimed the rest of the land, after the exclusion of a fifth portion in favour of the State, to be divided among them as their property and the inhabitants to be declared slaves. Omar, however, over-ruled such claims and decided, on his own responsibility, that the Sawād was to remain undivided and inalienable as crown-lands and its income, henceforth, to be set apart for the common welfare of Muslims. The inhabitants of the Sawād were to cultivate the land as before, pay the land and capitation taxes and were not to be treated as slaves. On the other hand, he allowed movable property and stock of cattle found in the Sawād, after the deduction of the one-fifth for the State, to be divided among the troops as booty of war.[1] This statement is in complete accordance with what I have quoted on a previous occasion on this subject from Ibn ' Asākir.[2] Moreover Omar had promised one-fourth of the land of Sawād to the Bajīlah tribe, which had contributed a fourth of the army, which in the decisive battle of Qādisiyyah conquered the Persians. But later on, when he saw that he could not satisfy the claims of the rest of the army in the

also parts of Mesopotamia and Assyria. Watered by the Euphrates and the Tigris it has been since the remotest antiquity one of the most fertile, blessed and thickly-populated lands of Asia. One of the most frequented commercial and trading routes led from here and from Syria, Asia Minor and Persia down to the sea from where a very lively exchange of wares took place by sea from Apollogos, the Ubullah of the Arab geographers with Hinder Asia and India, as the Eastern Arabia, the East African coast and the lands on the Red Sea. Von Kremer, Culturgeschichte des Orient, Vol. I, p. 72; about Ubullah, see Ranke, Weltgeschichte, Vol. V, p. 128; Muir's Caliphate, p. 132; about ' Udhaib see Sprenger, Die Post-und Reiserouten des Orients, p. 112; De Goeje, Zur historischen Geographie Babyloniens Z. D. M. G., Vol. XXXIX. p. 1, Tr.

[1] Bilādhurī, p. 267.

[2] Gesch. d. herrsch. Ideen, p. 460.

same proportion, he succeeded in inducing the Bajīlah tribe to resign their claim upon the Sawād against obtaining for every one of the members of the tribe an increase to 2,000 dirhams (about 1,400 francs) in the annuity granted out of the State chest.[1] That this policy of Omar was sound, is undoubted, when we consider that the revenue of the Sawād amounted yearly to 120 million dirhams (about 84 million francs).[2] In order to form a correct estimate of the position of the non-Muslim population, we must need have a glance at Omar's system of taxation. Directly after the conquest, Omar sent a deputation to make a survey of the Sawād, who fixed the land capable of cultivation at about 36 million jarīb. (It would be a little more than ten and a half million acres.)

Jarīb is a square-measure which is supposed to be equal to 3,600 square yards. The Arab yard was the same as the Roman cubitus. If we take it that it corresponded roughly to the Roman foot, being smaller than it by a third, a jarīb would correspond to the Roman clima of 3,600 square feet, and so a jarīb would be equal to 314 square metres (1 clima = 314·86 square metres). The whole extent of the land capable of cultivation would be about $1\frac{1}{8}$ million Hectare (9 Hectare = about $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres). Upon every jarīb a tax of one dirham in coin and one qafīz *in natura* was levied (one dirham is about 70 centimes). Qafīz is a dry-measure which Xenophon mentions in the Anabasis under the name of *kapithe* and which was equal to two *chœnixes*. By the Arabs a qafīz

[1] Bilādhurī, p. 268.

[2] Māwardī ed. Enger, p. 305; Bilādhurī fixes the revenue at 100 million dirhams, p. 270 [Yāqūt, Vol. III, p. 179. Translator.]

is variously fixed but usually at 96 Ratl. Besides this tax the following other imposts were levied upon the non-Muslim population :—for every jarīb of date plantation, 10 dirhams; for every jarīb of vineyard, 10 dirhams; for every jarīb of sugarcane (Qaṣab), 6 dirhams; for every jarīb of wheat, 4 dirhams; for every jarīb of barley, 2 dirhams. Finally, the capitation-tax was assessed and levied as follows :—(1) the highest class, 48 dirhams; (2) middle class, 24 dirhams; (3) lowest class, 12 dirhams; women and children, however, were free from capitation-tax. It was levied only on full-grown men. All non-Muslims were enjoined to carry round their necks a leaden seal which probably served as an official control-mark for payment of taxes. Omar's superintendent of taxes at the Sawād distributed 550,000 of such control-marks.[1] The entire subject population stood under the unfettered control and discretion of the

[1] Bilādhurī, pp. 271-272. On the capitation-tax in general see Māwardī, p. 249. [The non-Muslim, besides the capitation-tax, had to supply provisions and clothing for the troops according to the following scale fixed by Omar. "The inhabitants of 'Irāq had to pay in kind for every Muslim 15 Sā' of wheat and a certain quantity of melted butter; the Egyptians had to pay monthly an Irdab of corn and a certain quantity of butter and honey and in addition to this a certain quantity of linen stuff for the clothing of the troops; lastly, they had to give to every Muslim three days' free entertainment: the inhabitants of Syria had to pay monthly two mudd of corn, three Qisṭ of oil and likewise butter and honey." Von Kremer, Culturgeschichte des Orients, Vol. I, p. 61. It is to be borne in mind, however, as Mr. Arnold in his "Preachings of Islam" points out "that jizyah was levied on the able-bodied males, in lieu of the military service they would have been called upon to perform, had they been Muslims, and it is very noticeable that when any Christian people served in the Muslim army they were exempted from the payment of this tax. Such was the case with the tribe of Jarājimah, a Christian tribe in the neighbourhood of Antioch, who made peace with the Muslims, promising to be their allies and fight on their side in battle *on condition that they should not be called*

conquerors, whose number could hardly have exceeded 200,000. So far we have noticed nothing in the system of taxation which might be considered oppressive. But we should not forget that, at the conquest, the native population had suffered a considerable loss of property and that further it lay under the obligation of supplying provisions for the troops which might happen to pass through the country. In Egypt Muslims had the right of three days' entertainment at the house of every Christian. (Suyūṭī, Ḥusnu-Muḥā-ḍharah, Vol. I, p. 62.) The same rule obtained currency in Syria and probably ' Irāq. Moreover, the subject population had to keep the canals, dams and bridges in repair and probably also to offer their services for other Government purposes. We also know that the land-tax which had to be paid by every *Ra'iyyah* community soon began to be regarded as an unalterable sum which could not be lessened on any account.[1] But in such a community decrease in the population necessarily meant a weakening of its capacity for paying taxes. It was precisely for this reason that Omar recommended to his Governors remission of taxes when the *Ra'iyyah* were unable to meet their liabilities. It is scarcely to be doubted that a decrease in the population speedily took place, and with it its effect was soon perceptible. Many indeed got rid of the foreign rule by flight and emigration, many, on

upon to pay jizyah and should receive their proper share of booty. See Abū Yusuf, p. 81; Bilādhurī, p. 159.) When the Arab conquests were pushed to the north of Syria in A. H. 22, a similar agreement was made with a frontier tribe which was exempted from the payment of jizyah in consideration of military service. Ṭabarī, 1st series, p 2665. Arnold, p. 56. Translator.

[1] *Cf.* Müller, Islam im Morgen-und Abendland, Vol. I, pp. 281-2; Von Kremer, Culturgeschichte, Vol. I, pp. 277 and 439 *et seq.*, *Tr.*

the other hand, accepted Islam. Omar sought to place difficulties in the way of conversion to Islam; for he laid down that on conversion, only moveable properties could be retained; while interests in land had to be surrendered to the State. However the Neo-Muslims might feel themselves aggrieved by this measure, they felt still more so when, to prevent the appreciable diminution of the revenue, they were made to pay the capitation-tax which was levied upon them before their conversion. Moreover, it appears that Neo-Muslims were never conceded the privilege of a State-annuity or, at all events, never regularly.[1] When at last under the third Caliph, the Caliph 'Uthmān, the principles established by Omar that no Muslim could acquire landed property gave away completely both in theory and practice, not only Muslims acquired land but also non-Muslims retained their landed-properties; the oldest jurists were already prepared with distinctions disadvantageous to the Neo-Muslims. They enunciated the proposition that, while Neo-Muslims must needs pay the land-tax, as before, over and above the capitation-tax, which used to be levied upon them, original Muslims need only pay the tenth.[2] During 'Uthmān's rule when the aristocratic party of Mekka got the Government under control, it allowed itself the greatest possible license. It acquired immense landed-property and even claimed the Sawād as its exclusive property, for, said the aristocratic "party of Mekka," Sawād is the garden of the

[1] *Cf.* Ibn Athīr, V, pp. 37, 44.

[2] Bilādhurī, p. 447; Yāqūt, Mu'jam, Vol. I, pp. 48-51; Ibn Athīr, Vol. IV, p. 374; Ibn Khaldūn, General History, Cairo Ed., Vol. III, p. 87. Here "Muslims" is used to signify those who were the descendants of the conquerors as opposed to the "Neo-Muslims," who were native converts.

Quraish. They can take from it whatever they please.[1] Thus in the conquered lands the relation of the various elements of population became more and more strained and conflicting. An old and well-informed author gives us some information on the position of the clients, which shows us how the clients were treated by the Arabs as an inferior race. We read in the ' Iqd of Ibn ' Abdi-Rabbih the following passage,[2] which is evidently taken from the work of Jāḥidh on the clients :—Nāfi Ibn Jubair allowed a client to lead the prayer. For it he was reproached, but he replied : " I only wished to demean myself before God by performing my prayer behind a client." This Nāfi used to ask, whenever a funeral passed by his house, who the dead person was. If the answer was he was of the Quraish, he called out : ' Oh, what a loss to his tribe.' If the dead person was merely an Arab, he said : ' Oh, what a loss to his home!' If the dead person happened to be a client, he said : 'One of the herd of God who takes whatever he wishes and leaves whatever he wills.' People used to say : ' three things, if they happen to pass before the person praying, cancel the prayer ; these are a donkey, a dog and a *client*.' Further, clients were never addressed by Kunyas (*i.e.*, father of so and so), but simply by their names or nick-names. Nor would Arabs walk in their midst nor let them go ahead of them in festive processions. If they came to dinner, they had to sit behind the Arabs. If a

[1] Aghānī, Vol. XI, p. 80; Mas'ūdī, Vol. IV, p. 262 (Paris Ed.).

[2] Cairo Ed., p. 73, Vol. II; Jāḥidh was a disciple of An Naḍhḍhām, the celebrated rationalist. See Ibn Khall, Vol. I, p. 186, note 4. Jāḥidh died at Baṣrah in the month of Mohurrum A. H. 255 (Dec.-Jan. A. D., 868-9), Ibn Khall., Vol. II, p. 409. *Tr.*

client was entertained on account of his age or his piety or his learning, he had to sit apart so that no one could mistake him for a genuine Arab.[1] Moreover, a client was not allowed to perform the funeral prayer over a deceased Muslim if an Arab was present, however distinguished the client might be. If anybody wanted to marry the daughter of a client he had to make the proposal not to the father or the mother of the girl, but had to make it to the patron of the client (*Patronus* of Roman Law), and the patron either gave or withheld his consent as he pleased. If, on the contrary, the father or the mother of the girl gave her in marriage, it was considered absolutely null and void, even if the marriage had been consummated. The status thus created was looked upon merely as that of concubinage and not of lawful marriage.

It is obvious from the passage quoted above how little inclined the Arabs were to allow absolute equality to recent converts. The genuine Arab considered himself infinitely higher and nobler than either the recent Persian or Syrian convert. Out of such relations arose a party, which is known as the Shu'ūbiyyah or " parti-

[1] The division of Arab society into قرشي - عربي - مولي will be found in Mas'ūdī, Vol. V, p. 27. The word عربي signifies a free but not a noble-born Arab. In Bilādhurī, p. 455, the following division will be found : صريح Arab of pure descent, حليف sworn confederate, مولي client : Appendix III.

[The relation of protector and protected was created by a solemn engagement and oath so that the jār is also called halif or hilf. The exact nature of the engagement might vary but very often the covenant made the *outlaw* the son of the protector, and gave him all the rights and duties of a tribesman. Robertson Smith's Kinship and Marriage, p. 53. The only

sans of the Gentiles,"[1] which not only set up as its cardinal principle the perfect equality of the Arabs and the foreigners, but even went further and declared the Persians superior to the Arabs. In their attacks against the hegemony of the Arabs they relied upon various passages of the Qur'ān and the sayings of the Prophet, where the equality of all Muslims was proclaimed. Thus it is said in the Qur'ān:[2] "Truly, the most worthy of honour in the sight of God is he who feareth Him most; for the faithful are brethren; wherefore make peace between your brethren." Then they quoted from the parting sermon of the Prophet: "O men! God has taken away from you the arrogance and pride of ancestry of heathen days. An Arab has no other excellence or superiority over a barbarian than that which is secured to him by his God-fearing and righteousness. You are all the progeny of Adam, and Adam himself is of the earth."[3] The Arabs met these passages of the Qur'ān and tradition by saying that they were not to be taken literally, but only in the sense that all Muslims were to be regarded as equal as regards religious precepts before God and in the future life, but they had no application or bearing in this life, for otherwise all distinctions of rank and position would cease. Moreover, the Prophet has himself said, "If a nobleman of a nation comes to you, do him honour." Of a similar refrain is the saying

difference was the blood-money for the death of a dependent was not so high as for a Sarih (Arab of pure descent). Further in Medina the sworn ally had a claim on the inheritance of his protector. According to the commentators on Sura, 4, 37, a man's *holafa* took one-sixth of his estate. *Ibid.*, p. 55, *Tr.*]

1 See Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, pp. 265-270. *Tr.*

2 Qur'ān, 49, 13; *cf.* Weil, Leben, p. 372 and note; Qur'ān, 49, 10.

3 In Bukhrī's Collection this passage is not found.

of the Prophet: "Be indulgent to the faults of influential men."[1] Finally, the Prophet had called Qais Ibn 'Aṣim Lord of the Arabs. The Muslims of foreign nationality, the advocates of equality (اهل التسويه), as they are called in Arab writings, urged that they willingly admitted differences of rank and position, but that such distinctions should be founded upon personal merits and not upon the accident of birth or ancestry. "Noble is he who has ennobled himself by his deeds and who has rendered himself conspicuous by the nobility of his soul." In this sense they understood the tradition concerning Qais Ibn 'Aṣim quoted above. They fondly appealed to the words of one of the noblest men of Arab antiquity—'Amir Ibn Ṭufail:—

> Tho' I be the chief of the 'Amirides and a knight famous among them in every expedition.
> The 'Amirides have chosen me their chief indeed not on account of any right of inheritance.
> God forbid that I should become chief on account of father or mother.
> But I protect their territory and guard it from misfortune and shoot at any one who shoots at them.

This misunderstanding between the Arabs and Neo-Muslims contributed largely to the incessant insurrections and rebellions against the Government, which took place in 'Irāq and which gave so much trouble to the Omayyad Caliphs that they had to send so energetic a governor as Ḥajjāj to restore peace and establish authority.[2] And it was only with such violent measures

[1] Maidānī, Prov. Arab, Vol. II, p. 286.

[2] The chief cause of this insurrection was that the neo-converts had been made to pay capitation-tax; Ibn Athīr, Vol. IV, p. 374 *et seq.*

as the new governor had recourse to, that he succeeded in restoring order. An insurrection took place at Baṣrah in which a large number of theologians and old warriors took part. Ḥajjāj got the better of the rebels and decided to divide the client-class once and for all, so that they might not combine or conspire against the Government again. He sent for them and spoke to them: "You are wretched foreigners and barbarians and you had better remain in your villages." Thereupon he ordered the clients to be distributed in the villages. Thus he broke up their party completely. In order that none of the clients should leave the village to which he had been sent, he caused the name of the village to be branded on the hands of the client. This put an end to the aspirations of equality with the ruling class harboured by clients and neo-converts, but the discontent remained and probably contributed largely to the ruin of the Omayyad dynasty. As generally happens, with the change of dynasty the oppressed party came to the helm of the State and obtained the greatest influence at the Court of the Caliph. The 'Abbāsids owed their success to the Persian troops under Abū Muslim in ousting the Omayyads from the throne and in establishing themselves in their place. Thus the Persians and Muslims of Persian origin rose to power and affluence, and though many of them outwardly assumed the mask of Islam, yet in their heart of hearts they clung to the faith of their forefathers. And the influence which these Persians and their adherents brought to bear upon the Caliphate is of such profound significance that it is to be reckoned as one of the most important phenomena of the history of the civilization

of Islam. At an early stage Arab blood had commingled with that of the Persians. Muslim legislation tried its utmost, indeed, to prevent a close union between the Arabs and foreigners. In the earliest collection of juridico-theological precepts, the Muwaṭṭa', we meet with a passage according to which it is forbidden to marry Jewish and Christian slave girls; a Persian slave girl, however, could not even be kept as a concubine by a Muslim.[1] In spite and in defiance of such precepts the Arabs entered into various relations with the Persian and Aramæan inhabitants of 'Irāq and indeed only too soon.

Baṣrah, which in the first century after Mohammed, was the most important town of this province and lay close to the Arabian desert, counted a large population which spoke Persian as its mother-tongue.[2] It was here that the first school of Arab learning arose. The schools of Mekka and Medina had confined their activity to the Qur'ān and tradition. At Baṣrah, however, grammatical and philological studies were carried on in addition, and early enough in its history scholastic and philosophical tendencies manifested themselves. There it was again that the effect of intercourse with foreigners made itself clearly perceptible, and, according to a story often repeated, it was at Baṣrah that the corruption creeping into the Arabic language necessitated the establishment of fixed rules of grammar to save the Arabic language from further decay and abuse. It need scarcely be mentioned here that this story is totally devoid of credit or

[1] Vol. III, p. 23, Cairo Ed.

[2] Aghānī, XVII, p. 56, Vol. X, p. 106; *cf.* Brockelmann, Arab. Litteratur, p. 98 *et seq.* *Tr.*

foundation. Arabic grammar is a creation of foreigners, the Aramæans and Persians, and was brought into being by the need felt by foreigners of learning to write and speak the Arabic language correctly; particularly by the non-Arabs who wished to devote themselves to learned studies. The founders of Arabic grammar are the foreigners of Aramaic and Persian nationalities who had gone over to Islam. When it became a fashion to make a show of learned studies and write books, the Arab *savants* likewise applied themselves to those studies. The Arabs, whose popular language had already substantially departed from the language of the Qur'ān, cultivated and developed the science of language with the true Semitic zeal for subtlety, to a system which degenerated into vague and abstruse hairsplitting and which rightly or wrongly has alone remained predominant. But shrewd men who ridiculed and found fault with their system were not wanting among the Arabs. Jāḥiḍh, the rationalist, has left us an amusing remark, in his conversation with Akhfash, the celebrated grammarian of that time. "I spoke," says he, "to Akhfash, the most learned grammarian of our time, saying why do you not write your books intelligibly, and how is it that we understand only parts of them, while by far the greater part remains unintelligible to us, and why do you place unintelligible things in the opening pages of your book and leave the intelligible ones for the end?" He answered, "I am one who does not write books for the love of God. Moreover these are not books dealing with questions of religion. If I were to write as you wish me, the readers would only very rarely have

occasion to consult me. My object is the gain of wealth. I write some things which are easy of understanding so that the charm of that which is understood might make the readers curious to know what they do not understand. By this means I acquire money and that is the aim with which I write." And this Akhfash who so candidly told tales out of school is the very same Akhfash who is considered one of the greatest authorities on grammatical science. It appears that the new system needed time to find sympathy with the genuine Arabs who cared in the beginning all the less for it, as they were the masters of the living laws of the language. The author of the *Fihrist* informs us[1] that the great philologer Abū ʻUbaidah could not recite a single verse without committing mistakes of vowel points, which only means that he set a higher value on the popular mode of recitation than the rules of grammar which considerably differed from it. Ibn Khaldūn, a philosophic thinker, has passed the same verdict on the mock-learning of the grammarians which degenerated into ridiculous pedantry, and I believe I am not called upon to pursue this point any further after referring to what has been said by him.[2] The Arabs of the first century were brave but rude barbarians compared to the Byzantines and Persians, who had been trained in the arts of peace and of a very ancient civilization. To their schools the Arabs went, and from them they learnt with astonishing quickness the arts of social enjoyment, luxury, and license. Those who sat on the Caliph's throne at

[1] P. 53 [Ibn Khall., Vol. III, p. 389, *Tr.*]

[2] Ibn Khaldūn, Prolg., Vol. III, pp. 355 *et seq.*

Damascus and saw suddenly placed in their hands the reins of an immense government sought to surround themselves with the splendour of majesty so far as was consistent with the Bedouin customs which were still prevalent in the early times. They borrowed from the Byzantine Court the horrible custom, hitherto unknown to the Arabs, of employing eunuchs for the service of the interior of the Caliph's palace and particularly for the *Harems*. Although castration is said to have been forbidden by Mohammed,[1] Jāḥiḍh says about it : the custom of castration has come from the Byzantines, and it is wonderful that they are just the Christians who boast of their superiority over other people in clemency, humanity and compassion. The custom of castration suffices as an example of their cruelty, and this detestable operation of castration is a proof of their barbarism.

The Arabs very soon after their conquest of ' Irāq and Persia obtained precise information about the court and splendour of the Persian Kings. The Omayyad Caliphs imitated them a great deal. In spite of the prohibition of the Qur'ān, the custom of drinking wine was introduced, very early indeed, at the court of the Omayyad Caliphs. At first they drank boiled juice of grapes (طلاء), or a drink borrowed from the Greeks which they called by the Greek name of Rasāṭūn (رساطون). Even, in later times, at the treasury at Baghdād a crystal cup of a large circumference was shown, as a curiosity, in which Umm Hakīm, the wife of the Caliph Hishām,

[1] Muwaṭṭa', Vol. IV, p. 164. [See Finlay, Hist. of Greece, Vol. II, p. 302, note (2), Muāwiyah was the first to employ eunuchs in his service. Suyuti, T. Kh., p. 22, *Tr.*]

12—1903 B

used to take her morning draught. Just as at Roman drinking bouts, so on festive occasions, at the court of Baghdād, the drinkers were decorated with garlands and flowers.[1]

The court etiquette, however, during the Omayyad rule was by no means very severe or unbending. Everybody was granted access, and the Caliph allowed important persons to take their seat either by his side on the *divan* or on special cushions or chairs. The report of a courtier has come down to us who relates how he, one evening, happened to be at the court of the Caliph Walīd II, when the moon was in the second quarter. A large tray with cups was brought to him, and when he enquired as to what kind of drink it was, he was informed that it was a Persian custom to take this drink, called

[1] The first Omayyad Caliphs used to drink milk mixed with honey or juice of pomegranate in which sugar was dissolved. (ماء الرمان مضروباً بالسكر الطبرزد), Kitābu-s-Surūr MS., Royal Library, Vienna. Later on at the court of Damascus boiled juice of grapes came into vogue. In 'Irāq people used to drink boiled date wine, but later on proper wine. Aghānī, Vol. II, p. 124, Al Fakhri, p. 257. [It appears that the use of Nabīdh had not been prohibited before the battle of Uḥud inasmuch as the Prophet is said to have taken Nabīdh on his way from Medina to Uḥud. Ibn Sa'd Tabaqāt, p. 63, Vol. III; Omar I's favourite drink was Nabīdh. *Ibid.*, pp. 230, 244. The prohibition of drinking wine imposed by Islam was most distasteful to the Arabs. Goldziher, Muh. Studien, pp. 22-23. On page 23, note (2), Goldziher observes : The continual protest against the prohibition of wine will be seen from the fact that as late as the third century of the A. H. traditions were in circulation which could be used in defence of the enjoyment of wine. The theologian Al Muzani (d. 204) was called upon to explain the reasons which cast suspicion and discredit upon traditions favouring the enjoyment of wine. Ibn Khall., nr. 92, Vol. I, p. 126. A large number of traditions was collected which favoured and justified the laxer practice. Iqd, Vol. III, pp. 409-419. Very early indeed concession was made in favour of date-wine. Z.D.M.G., Vol. XLI, p. 95. See Khuda Bukhsh's "Arabs before Islam." *Tr.*]

Haftagah, for seven weeks at a particular time of the year.[1] In imitation of the old Persian custom the Caliphs, during evening entertainments, when singers and musicians came to play, set behind a curtain which was let down in the middle of the saloon and separated them from their courtiers and musicians. This custom, however, was not followed by all the Caliphs.[2]

[1] Aghānī, VI, p. 130. The pious Caliph Omar II, immediately on his accession, issued an order prohibiting the use of wine. [See Goldziher, Muh. Studien, Vol. II, p. 74. *Tr.*]

[2] قطب السرور I must note this extremely valuable work was composed at the time of the Caliph Al-Qā'im as is expressly stated there; while Flügel makes the author die a hundred years earlier. [Jauzī in his Mir'ātu-z-Zamān gives the reasons for the prohibition of wine in Islam. MS., Khuda Bukhsh's Oriental Public Library, Folio 47 A. & B. On folio 48 A he gives the list of men who prohibited the use of wine 'in the days of ignorance,' on folio 67A occurs the following passage :

الطلق عثمن بن مطعون و عبيدة بن الحرث و ابو عبيدة بن الجراح
حتى اتوا رسول الله صلعم ـ فعرض عليهم الاسلام فاسلوا في ساعة واحدة
و ذلك قبل دخول رسول الله صلعم دار الارقم و هاجر عمن الى الحبشة
الهجرتين و حرم الخمر فى الجاهلية و قال لا اشرب شيئا يذهب عقلي
و يضحك بي من هو ادلي و يحملني ان انكح كريمتي من لا اريد ـ
فنزل تحريم الخمر في سورة المائدة ـ

About Jauzī, see Ibn Khall., Vol. IV, p. 244; Vol. I, p. 439, note (12). In vivid contrast to this stands the conduct of Mohammad Ibnu-l-Hasan—a descendant of 'Ali about whom says Ibn Hazm (MS., Khuda Bukhsh's Library.) Folio 17 B.

و كان من افسق الناس يشرب الخمر علانية فى مسجد النبي صلى
الله عليه و سلم نهاراً و فسق فيه بقينة لبعض اهل مدينة ـ]

About the different kinds of wine in use at the time of the Omayyads, see De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, p. 126; Walid II's mode of drinking wine, p. 129. *Translator.*]

The art of singing and music which stood in high favour at the court of Damascus was brought to the Arabs by the Persians, and the first and the best singers, both male and female, were either of Persian origin or indeed pupils of Persian teachers.[1] Luxury had become rampant at the court of the Caliphs. It stood in boldest contrast to the simplicity of the first Caliphs who in their outward appearance and the general tone of their life were in no way distinguished from the great masses of the people.[2] The Caliph Walīd II carried round his neck gold chains set with precious stones which he changed daily.[3] And an Omayyad Governor of a distant province (Khurāsān) wrote in his report addressed to the Court that the land-tax of the entire province was not enough to defray the expenses of his kitchen.[4] Even the Persian costume was gradually adopted, and the General Yazīd Ibn Muhallab caused an Arab to be punished because he had dared to show himself in an elegant Persian dress.[5] In their bias for everything Persian as opposed to Arabian, they went much further. The following account of an eye-witness may be adduced in proof :—

"Ismā'īl Ibn Yasār was of Persian descent. His forefathers, like those of so many other Persians, had sought and obtained as clients the protection of a genuine Arab

[1] Aghānī, Vol. I, p. 98; Vol. XVI, p. 13.

[2] Al Fakhrī, p. 89, *Tr.*

[3] Aghānī, Vol. VI, p. 129.

[4] Aghānī, Vol. XIII, p. 56.

[5] Yazīd Ibn Muhallab took over the Governorship of 'Irāq in the year 96 A. H. [Compare with this the policy of the 'Abbāsid Caliphs. Mu'taṣim showed an open dislike towards the Arabs, see Ibn Athir, Vol. VI, p. 319; *cf.* Taghrybardy, Vol. I, p. 642; De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, p. 478; Von Kremer's Culturgeschichte, Vol. I, p. 335; about Ma'mūn see Prof. Browne's

tribe and were thenceforth called the clients of the Taim tribe. In spite of this he glowed with enthusiasm for everything Persian. Originally a great supporter of the rival Caliph of Mekka, ' Abdullah Ibnu-z-Zubair, he sang later on the praises of the Omayyads, when these had defeated ' Abdullah Ibnu-z-Zubair. Once he obtained admission to the Caliph Hisham who received him at his castle called Ruṣāfah. The Caliph sat at the edge of the marble fountain and bid the poet recite something. He began to recite a poem in which he boasted of his Persian descent and in which the following lines occurred :—

> " I swear, by my ancestor, my wood is not brittle in war and my fountain not dry;
> My tribe is noble and my glory unmatched,
> And a tongue have I as sharp and poisonous as the sword,
> With which I guard the glory and renown of my house,
> Against every hero, though he be the bearer of a Crown.
> Princes were my ancestors, noble satraps of high breeding, generous, hospitable.[1]
> Comparable to Khusrau and Shapur with his hosts and Hurmazān in renown and consideration;
> Lions of the war-hosts, when they rushed forth on the day of battle,
> They humbled the Kings of the Turks and Greeks, they stalked in heavy coats of mail
> As ravenous lions stalk forth.
> There, if thou askest, wilt thou learn that we are descended from a race which excels all others." [2]

Lit. Hist. of Persia, pp. 255, 265; about Mutawakkil see Von Kremer's Culturgeschichte, Vol. I, pp. 237-8; *cf.* Ibn Khaldūn, General Hist., Vol. III, p. 275; *cf.* Goldziher. Muh. Studien, Vol. I, p. 151; about Muhtadi see Von Kremer's Culturgeschichte, Vol. I, p. 238, *Tr.*]

[1] See Lit. Hist. of Persia, p. 266; about Ruṣāfah see De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, p. 81, *Tr.*

[2] Aghānī, Vol. IV, p. 125.

So far the Caliph had heard him silently. But now he could not control himself any longer. He jumped up and called out: "Throw him in the fountain." The ready hands of the zealous court-attendants threw the tactless poet into the fountain where they gave him a plunge which nearly drowned him. Then the Caliph banished him from Syria, and he hurriedly returned to Arabia to ponder undisturbed over the glory of his Persian forefathers.

With the fall of the Omayyads and the accession of the 'Abbāsids to the throne a more favourable epoch set in for the Persians and their friends.[1] There were many Persians at the court and in the capital. They partly enjoyed royal favours and filled important posts which brought them wealth and influence. We need not refer here specially to the famous family of the Barmecides, which ruled over the Caliphate with unlimited power until their tragic fall. Persians received high military commands. Even under the Caliph Hādī, a Persian, who traced his descent from an old Persian family of satraps and who on his conversion to Islam had become a client to the Caliph Manṣūr, was invested with military

[1] When the Caliph Ma'mūn had conquered Baghdād an influential Arab chief rose against him. On being questioned the reason of his opposition to the 'Abbāsids and their rule, he answered: "because they prefer Persians to the Arabs." Ibn Khaldūn, General Hist., Vol. III, p. 241. [It may be noted here that the Arabian national pride, as distinct from tribal pride, is hardly in its first beginnings older than the victory of Dhu Car (611 A.D.). Up to that time no Arab thought himself better than a Persian. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage, p. 189, note. In the early Arab literature there is nothing which shows that Arabs looked down upon foreigners (Persians specially). Goldziher, Muh. Studien, Vol. I, p. 104, *Tr.*]

command and the right to collect the taxes of the important province of Khūzistan.[1]

This indeed called forth a great deal of ill-humour on the side of the old Arab party, which frequently expressed its feelings very candidly. I place here a satire directed against the Persians at the time of the first ʻAbbāsids, which is quite characteristic of the sentiments of the Arab party.[2]

God so ordained it that I knew you ere fortune smiled upon you, when ye still sat in the Hay Market,

But not a year had elapsed ere I saw you strutting about in silk and brocade and velvet.

Then your women sat in the sun and moaned under the water-wheels in harmony with the turtle doves:

Now they trail skirts of flowered silk from the looms of ʻIrāq and all kinds of silk stuffs from Dakn and Tarun.

They have already forgotten how but a little while since they broke the Halani stones in the quarries,

And how they carried bundles of moss in the skirts of their frocks.

And when they had grown rich then spoke they, with impudent falsehood:

"We are the noble ones, the sons of the Dihqāns."

If one questions the meanest and commonest of them, he answers

Full of arrogance, "I am a son of Bahram Chubin."

[1] The Caliph Manṣūr already appointed one of his clients Governor of Sūs and Jundaisābūr. Aghānī, Vol. XIII, p. 75; *Ibid.*, Vol. XX, p. 82. [Suyūṭī says about Manṣūr "he was the first who employed slaves (Mawālī) in offices of trust and gave them precedence over Arabs;" Text, p. 22. *Translator.*]

[2] The Caliph Hādī. [It should be observed that this is not directed against Persians, but against Nabatæans who falsely claimed to be Persians. Had Von Kremer translated lines 10 and 11, he must have seen this. *Tr.*]

Adding thereto " Khusrau endowed me with goods and made me his inheritor: who dares to set himself up against me?" [1]

It is impossible to attack the Persian pride and vanity more deeply and venomously than in this poem, the greater portion of which is unfortunately untranslatable on account of its strange expressions and metaphors. Then it proceeds :

See, they have taken off their saddles from donkeys and now ride about on costly mules.

From kitchen gardens they have made their entry into the Palaces of Princes and gates of the Sultans.

They cherish hatred against the Arabs because they hate the prophet of God and his religion.

But such outbursts of passion and indignation on the part of the Arabs, who saw their power and influence wrecked and lost, did not alter the natural course of events. Persian influence increased at the court of the Caliphs and reached its zenith under Hādī, Hārūn and Ma'mūn. Most of the ministers of the last were Persians or of Persian extraction.[2] In Baghdād Persian fashions continued to enjoy an increasing ascendancy. The old Persian festivals of Nawrūz, Mihrjān and Ram were celebrated.[3] Persian raiment was the official court dress and the tall, black, conical Persian hats [Qalansuwa (Pl.)

[1] I have adopted Professor Browne's translation which is indeed unsurpassable. Lit. Hist. of Persia, pp. 266-7.

[2] Ma'mūn appointed three Persians directors of the " House of Wisdom " founded by him : one of these is known as a great opponent and enemy of the Arabs. Fihrist, p. 120. [See Z. D. M. G., p. 624, year 1859, *Tr.*]

[3] [Nawrūz, see Ibn Khall Vol. I, p. 340, note 13; *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 53; also Vol. I. p. 203; Browne, p. 259. *Tr.*]

Qalānis] similar to our European top-hat were already prescribed as official by the second 'Abbāsid Caliph (in A.H. 153=770 A.D.). At the court the customs of the Sassanian kings were imitated and garments decorated with golden inscriptions introduced, which it was the exclusive privilege of the ruler to bestow.[1] A coin of Mutawakkil shows us this prince actually clothed in true Persian fashion.[2] Although in the earliest times, Islam was in no way severe against human images, we must still be perfectly certain, in the face of such evidence, that at the Caliph's court the old Muslim prejudices had completely given way, and in this respect also the examples of the Sassanians followed. The tendency to adopt and follow the Persian lead at the Court and in the influential circles, brought with it manifest signs of a great and general fermentation in religious matters. There was in 'Iraq not an inconsiderable number of Muslims who paid silent homage to religious views which were quite foreign to Islam, either inherited from their forefathers, or as the result of their intercourse with foreigners. Under the 'Abbāsids such ideas sprang up with yet greater luxuriance. Baṣrah, the greatest centre of commerce of the

[1] Ibn Khaldūn, Muqaddamah, Vol. II, Ch. 38; دار الطراز Also on the banners the name of the ruling Caliph was embroidered with gold.

[It appears that the Omayyad Caliphs also used the Qalansuwah on public occasions, *e.g.*, Walīd Ibn 'Abdul Malik; see De Goeje, Frag. Hist. Arab, Vol. I, p. 7, Ibn Hazm, MS. Khuda Bukhsh's Oriental Library, Bankipore. On Folio 107 occurs this passage : ومن بني الدول هوذة بن علي ترجة كسري

Ibn Duraid says : Haudhah was called Dha-a-Tāj because Chosrœs had given him a jewelled Qalansuwah, p. 209; *cf.* Iqd., p. 67, Vol. II. It appears that Qalansuwah was not unknown to the Arabs even in the Pre-Islamite times. *Tr.*]

[2] *Cf.* Gesch. d. herrsch. Idem, p. 48.

then Empire of the Caliphs, harboured within its walls not merely a large foreign non-Arab population which was partly Persian, but even Indian influence worked their way through commercial intercourse. In this town, for the first time, the doctrine of free-will, which had its origin at Damascus, was developed into a proper rationalistic school of theology, which subsequently under the name of the sect of the Mu'tazilī played a distinguished rôle. And in this town again arose the first free-thinkers who had the courage to break off, more or less, from Islam. Here it was that indifference to religion first showed itself, which later on spread even to the court of the Caliph.

Here it was, likewise, that about the middle of the second century of the Hegira, a small band of literary and intellectual men met together. Of some of these men we possess information. Foremost is to be mentioned the blind Bashshār Ibn Burd who acquired great fame as a poet. Bashshār was descended from an old Persian family which claimed royal blood. His father was brought as a slave by a victorious general to 'Irāq, where Bashshār was born. His mistress, a noble Arab lady, finally gave him his freedom, and from thenceforth he became her client. He lived at Baṣrah, but undertook several journeys to Baghdād at the court of the Caliph. His poetical talents were developed early, and the poet, blind from his birth, soon acquired a great renown. Besides Bashshār there lived and mixed with each other at Baṣrah several men who pondered over religious questions and drifted away into scepticism. They formed into a small sceptical and polemical society and held their meetings regularly at the house of one of the members. To

this circle belonged Bashshār, Wāṣil Ibn 'Aṭā,' who founded the oft-mentioned school of Mu'tazilīs, Jarīr Ibn Ḥāzm, 'Amr Ibn 'Ubaid and two others not specifically mentioned. From this small band proceeded various intellectual movements. Wāṣil became, as has been said, the founder of the Mu'tazilite sect; 'Amr Ibn 'Ubaid joined him; Jarīr however yielded to the view of the Buddhists (سمنيه), and the two who have not been specifically mentioned returned with repentance to the bosom of the orthodox church. Only Bashshār could not definitely make up his mind one way or the other, and remained a sceptic to the end of his days. He is said to have professed the doctrine of Ar-Raj'ah or return, and to have had strong leanings towards the old Persian ideas. In his poems the following verse is found justifying the Zoroastrian fire-worship :—

> The Earth is dark and the Fire resplendent.
> And the Fire has been adored since it became Fire.[1]

He expressed quite openly his sympathy for the Persians, but so long as he composed panegyrics on the reigning Caliph (Mahdī) he was left undisturbed to give vent to his enthusiasm for the Persians. But when he let loose his evil tongue and composed a satire on the then all-powerful first minister Ya'qūb Ibn Dā'ūd, in which he had a fling at the Caliph himself, the sentence of death was passed on him. The following were the fatal lines which cost him his life :—

> Awake, O Omayyads, you have slept long enough,
> Ya'qūb Ibn Dā'ūd is, verily, the Caliph now,

[1] [Ibn Khall., Vol. I, pp. 254-7; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Lit., Vol. I, pp. 73-74. Bashshār was put to death for his heterodoxy in A.D. 783-4; Aghānī III, p. 21; Goldziher, Muh. Studien, p. 162, Vol. I; Browne, p. 267. *Tr.*]

Your kingdom, O Muslims, is approaching its end,
Look at the Representative of God (the Caliph),
Enjoying himself with wine and lute.[1]

Bashshār is the true type of a very considerable class of men of those times who outwardly professed Islam but really were, more or less, untrue to it. Such were called Zindīqs; a word which assumed different meanings at different times. Originally it was applied to those who professed "Persian doctrines". Later on it meant "Professors of the Manichæan religion". It went on assuming, however, broader and broader meanings until it became synonymous with an Atheist, a despiser of religion. Such, however, were called Zindīqs even earlier. It is said that the tutor of the Omayyad Caliph Walid Ibn Yazīd was a Zindīq, who instilled in him a taste for wine and indifference to religion.[2] Against the Zindīqs the 'Abbāsids[3] were at times very severe. Still it is related of the first 'Abbāsid Caliph that he had a well-known

[1] Aghānī, III, p. 71: Ibn al-Athīr, VI, p. 16.

[2] [The ordinary explanation, says Prof. Browne, is that the term Zindīq is a Persian adjective meaning "one who follows the Zand, in preference to the sacred text, and that the Manichæans were so called because of their disposition to interpret, and explain the scriptures of their religion with their own ideas by a process akin to the *ta'wil* of the later Ismā'īlis" p. 159. Of those who, while outwardly professing Islam, were really Manichæans, the author of the Fihrist gives a long list which includes Al-Ja'd. b. Dirham, who was put to death by the Omayyad Caliph Hishām (A.D. 724-743); the poet Bashshār Ibn Burd put to death in A.D. 784; nearly all the Barmecides, the Caliph Al Ma'mūn, but this is not credited by the author; Mohammed Ibnu'z-Zayyāt, the vazir of Al Mu'taṣim, put to death in A.D. 847, and others, Browne, p. 164. *Tr.*]

Aghānī, Vol. II, p. 78.

[3] [Persecution of the Zindīqs, says Prof. Browne, is mentioned by Ṭabarī as occurring in the reign of Al Mahdī (A.D. 780, 782) and Al Hādī (A.D. 786-7). In the reign of Hārūnu-r-Rashīd a special inquisitor (Ṣāḥibu-z-Zanā-diqah) was appointed to detect and punish Manichæans

Zindīq, called 'Ajrad, as his drinking companion. This man was born in Kūfah and entered into the relation of a client to an Arab family. A contemporary of his relates as follows :—I had always thought that 'Ajrad had received the appellation of a Zindīq on account of the recklessness of his poems. But I was once locked up at Kūfah in the local Zindīq jail, and I met this 'Ajrad and noticed how he joined their prayer. In their religious worship they sang a poem composed by him in strophes of two verses each.[1] It is clear from this that Zindīqs were not rare at that time in Kūfah and that they even formed a religious community of their own. They believed in the dualistic system of religion, worshipped two Divine Beings, followed the teachings of Mani, and people spoke of them as adoring a human head.[2] These things are amply sufficient for us to identify the first Zindīqs with the Manichæans. But we have a yet clearer proof of it. We find in one of the earliest Arab authors, whose works have come down to us, a very remarkable passage in which he speaks about the religious books of the Zindīqs and gives their contents. And all that he has to say about them fits in exactly with what we know about the religious precepts and commands of the Manichæans from other sources. This passage, which has hitherto

amongst whom not only Persians and other foreigners, but even pure Arabs like the poets Ṣāliḥ-b-'Abdul Quddūs and Muṭī'b. Iyās were numbered. In the reign of Ma'mūn.................the lot of Zindīqs was less hard, p. 307. Compare with this the mild and tolerant policy of Omar and Uthmān. Von Kremer, Culturgeschichte des Orients, Vol. I, p. 59. See Huart's splendid paper entitled "Les Zindīqs en droit Musulman" in Actes du Onzième Congrès International des Orientalistes, pp. 69-80, *Tr.*]

[1] Aghānī, Vol. XII, p. 74.

[2] Aghānī, Vol. XIII, pp. 74, 76. About the worship of human head among the Sabæans *of* Chwolshon, Vol. I, p. 464, Vol. II, p. 19.

remained unknown, runs thus :—" Once Ibrāhīm Sindī said : ' I should be pleased if the Zindīqs were to spend less on the whitest, finest paper and the blackest ink and on the training of caligraphists, for indeed I do not know of more beautiful paper than that of their books, nor of finer writings than which one sees therein. Passionately fond as I am of money and distasteful as is its spending I would lay out much money, and willingly spend on books to show my enthusiasm for learning; since respect for learning is a proof of the nobility of soul and its soaring above the gusts of passion.' Upon which I replied to Ibrāhīm, ' When the Zindīqs lavish so much wealth on the decoration of their books it is like the spending of the Christians on their churches, for if these books were either philosophical or logical or juristic or were such books which taught various handicrafts, the various modes of earning livelihood or commercial business or contained explanations of those arts and crafts, which are valued among men, even if they had not been free from error or irreligion, we might have considered these people fond of learning and anxious for its diffusion. Instead of it their books are purely religious and contain nothing but the glorification of their faith. Their spending of money, therefore, is similar to that of the Magians, when these lay out wealth on their fire-temples, or of the Christians when they spend money on golden crosses, or the Indians who sacrifice wealth for the priests of Buddha. If they had learning in view, this would have been an easy matter to them, for books of wisdom are not forbidden to them, and the path of learning is easy and well-known. How is it then that they incur such heavy costs for their religious books just like the Christians who sumptuously

adorn their churches at a heavy expense? If this custom had found favour among Muslims, or if they believed that decoration conduces to the worship of God and promotes devotion, they would have produced, with ease, such things as the Christians, in spite of their effort, would have been incapable of. I saw the mosque of Damascus when it was splendidly decorated and adorned by one of the Omayyad Caliphs, and whoever then saw it felt that no one could attain the like and that the Byzantines could not rise to such expenditure. When Omar Ibn ʻAbdu-l-ʻAzīz, however, came to power he caused the gold chains of the lamps of the mosque to be melted down, so that the lamps might lose their attraction and brilliance. He considered that such show was opposed to the spirit of Islam; that such magnificence and elegant embellishment would stultify the heart and divert it from devotion, and that the mind would not be properly fixed on prayer so long as such splendour existed to amuse and divert it. But what proves the correctness of the view that I have set forth is the fact that in their books (Manichæans) there is to be found no single popular adage, no kind or sort of charming stories, no literary art, no important lessons of wisdom, no philosophy, no dialectic, no instruction in handicraft, no explanation of an instrument, no instruction on agriculture, no science of war, no apology for their religion or defence of their creed, but, on the contrary, their books are entirely taken up with questions of "light and darkness", the intercourse of devils and goblins, then the mention of Sindīd and the terror of the "pillars of the morning", and finally with the account of the Shaklun and the head, etc., etc. . . . . All is foolish talk, superstition and falsehood, without containing any

serious lessons or warning or any direction for making life useful, without offering any guidance to the masses or help to the cultured. It is not possible to conceive of a more wretched book or a more wretched arrangement than that which imposes the duty upon mankind of obeying and submitting to a religion, and that upon the sole basis of conviction and love ; while it brings forth nothing which contributes to the ennobling of life or the improvement of religion. Men, indeed, love either religion or the world. As regards the world it is necessary in order to set its business in motion and bribe honest natures, that it should appear in seductive forms ; and be disguised, like counterfeit gold or silver coin, which deceives many and is recognized only by a few. But the real cause of the expenses which the Manichæans incur over their books is not what you imagine. Indeed the more corrupt a religion is, the more it needs finery and embellishment, the more it needs partiality and the more it claims devotion and sacrifice for itself. Thus we know that Christianity is far more diffused than Judaism, and precisely in the same ratio is the zeal among its followers for defending and spreading it' ".

From this passage of the Arab *Savant* we infer, with certainty, that the writings of the Zindīqs of which he speaks, were no other than the religious writings of the Manichæans. The proofs are overwhelmingly convincing. He alleges as the peculiar characteristic of the writings of the Manichæans, their gorgeous illumination and workmanship. Augustine, speaking of the writings of the Manichæans, says : *tam multi et tam grandes et tam pretiosi codices vestri.*[1] And among the Persians

[1] Flügel, Mani, p. 385.

the *Book of Mani*, his evangel, has remained proverbial for its splendour and illumination. But what is still more decisive is that whatever Jāḥidh has said about the contents of the religious books of the Zindīqs, accords completely with the contents of the religious book of the Manichæans, so far as we are informed by the author of the Fihrist who lived a hundred years after Jāḥidh and specially with the contents of that portion of the Bible of the Manichæans which treats of the beginning of man and his original history. We find here again all the peculiar catchwords of the doctrines of Mani ; like Sindīd, " Pillars of Morning " (عامر الصبح), etc., etc. Jāḥidh had without a doubt the genuine books of the Manichæans before him ; in all probability in an Arabic translation. How very much known the doctrines of the Manichæans then were and what attention they received is best shown by the fact that two such important writers as Jāḥidh and Ibn Nadīm (the author of the Fihrist) expressly mention them, and the former indeed compares the Manichæan religion with Christianity and Judaism. The outlay of the Manichæans on the illumination and the finery of their books, at any rate, points to the fact that they were neither poor nor had any reason to conceal themselves. The Manichæan religion, so far as we can judge, had much which must have drawn people towards it. By working in Christian and Zoroastrian ideas into its own religious system it attracted powerfully both Christians and Zoroastrians ; while its outward form of Divine worship was surprisingly akin to Islam. The Manichæans, like the Muslims, had to perform a fixed number of daily prayers (4 or 7), and every prayer consisted of a number of prostrations like those which Mohammed afterwards

introduced. Purification before prayer by washing, as well as thirty days' fast, prevailed among the Manichæans before Mohammed, and it is not improbable that, as regards religious ceremonials, the prophet of Mekka partially accepted the Manichæan practices. The Manichæans might often have appeared dangerous to the rulers of Islam who repeatedly adopted severe measures against them. Thus acted the Caliph Hādī and Mahdī.[1] Under Harun even a special Inquisitor was appointed to detect and punish the Zindīqs.[2] Whoever was suspected of being a Zindīq was subjected to a severe and searching enquiry. The poet Sālih Ibn 'Abdul Quddus was put to death at the order of the Caliph. He professed the doctrines of the Manichæans, though a genuine Arab and not an *Arabicised Persian.* So also we know definitely of the poet Muṭī 'B. Iyās, who lived under the Caliph Mahdī. His daughter, on being examined by the Caliph Hārunu-r-Rashīd confessed that she was instructed in the doctrines of the followers of Mani and had read their religious book.[3] Thus it appears that even among genuine Arab Muslims Manichæanism had acquired adherents. Among Muslims of non-Arab nationality it was, doubtless, very popular. A very old and reliable author[4] asserts that the famous family of the Barmecides, with the exception of

[1] Dhahabi, Kitabul 'Ibar; Ibn Athīr, Vol. VI, pp. 41, 49, 53. The important passages on this subject will be found on p. 72, Vol. VII, Ibn Athīr.

[2] Aghānī, III, p. 124.

[3] Aghānī, XII, p. 89.

[4] The author of the Fihrist. [The ablution was in use in pagan South Arabia. See D. H. Müller, Hungarische Alterthümer im K. K. Museum Wien. I am indebted to Prof. Margoliouth for this note. *Tr.*]

one member was really Manichæan at heart.[1] Even the Caliph Ma'mūn is mentioned by the same author as a Zindīq, but it is indeed to be taken in the sense that he was not absolutely orthodox. In this the author of the Fihrist is supported and confirmed by others. Ma'mūn's disinclination to follow in the footsteps of his father as regards hostile measures against the Manichæans is best revealed by the following incident. Ma'mūn sent for the Superintendent of the Manichæan community of Rayy, called Yazdanbakht, to witness a discussion between him and Muslim theologians. Yazdanbakht is said to have been worsted in discussion; whereupon Ma'mūn invited him to the faith of Islam. But, although he refused to renounce his faith, Ma'mūn accorded him complete protection.[2] Under Ma'mūn the current was distinctly unfavourable to orthodox Islam, and the Caliph, who greatly favoured the Persians, was in no sense a religious bigot. To profess views a trifle heretical was, at that time, even in fashion, and a poet who lived from the time of Mahdī to that of Ma'mūn addressed the following lines[3] to one of his friends called Ziyād who, yielding to the general fashion, played the Zindīq, which was then considered a sign of culture and refinement.

> O Ibn Ziyād, father of Ja'far!
> Thou professest outwardly another creed than that

1 This famous family which for a long time held the first post in the Empire of the Caliph was of Persian origin and came from Balkh, where their ancestor was the high-priest of the Buddhist temple of Naubahār (Navavihára).

2 Fihrist, p. 338. Much is explained by the circumstance that Ma'mūn's mother was a Persian; a statement which is found in an ancient and well-informed author, De Geoje, Frag. Hist. Arab., Vol. I, p. 350.

3 I have adopted Prof. Browne's translation of these lines, p. 307. *Tr.*

Which thou hidest in thy heart,
Outwardly, according to thy words, thou art a Zindīq,
But inwardly thou art a respectable Muslim.
Thou art no Zindīq, but thou desirest to be regarded as in the fashion.

But Manichæanism, later on, even counted adherents at the Court of the Caliph, as the case of Afshīn, the all-powerful favourite of Mu'taṣim, proves.[1] According to the account preserved of his condemnation, it clearly appears that he professed the doctrines of Mani which were fairly diffused in the North of Persia and the lands along the Oxus to which Afshīn belonged, his province being Usrūshnah. We need not believe that, with the fall of Afshīn, things altered at the Court of the Caliph. Even after him Turkish and Persian favourites, mostly those who were originally slaves and only later on became freed-men, continued to be promoted to the highest offices of the Empire and direct and control the policy of the Court of Baghdād. Frequently, indeed, it was only their good looks that brought them to high distinctions and prominence; for the vice of carrying on amours with boys, to which originally the Arab was a stranger, began almost simultaneously with the growth of Persian influence to gain a horrible prevalence. From the point of view of a historian of civilization this deeply ugly side of the picture of oriental morals cannot be left unnoticed; though a closer examination would not be in its place

[1] On the fall of Afshín; Weil, Gesch., d. Chalifen, Vol. II, p. 326; Ibn Khaldun, General Hist., Vol. III, p. 268; Cairo Ed.; Ibn Athīr, Vol. VI, p. 362 [Sibṭ Ibn Jauzī states that the real name of Afshīn was Ḥaidar Ibn Kaus and the Governors of Usrūshnah, a Province of Transoxiana, bore the title of Afshīn in the same way as the King of Persia was called Chorocs, of Greece, Cæsar. Ibn Khall., Vol. I, p. 72, note 9. *Tr.*]

here, since we are primarily concerned with the workings and effects of foreign religious ideas on Islam. On this terrible demoralization, which combined unbounded oriental luxury with cynical-coarseness and which must have obtained currency in the higher circle at Baghdād, we find the best and the most valuable evidence in the works of the contemporary poets. Notably is it Abū Nu'ās, the privileged debauchee, the bold satirist to whom nothing is sacred or holy, who lays bare before us the moral dissoluteness of that epoch, when not only the wealth of Asia and Africa streamed in, but even the peculiar and characteristic vices of this part of the world were shamelessly blazoned at the Court of the Caliph. Of genuine religious feelings there could be no talk then. People ridiculed everything and indeed with impunity so long as they did not incur the suspicion of belonging to an anti-Islamic sect. They could doubt about Islam, but they must not profess another faith.

So quite unconcerned sings Abū Nu'ās :—

The chief mosque is, as I see it, the snare of Satan;
God has founded it under a star which was in no way unpropitious.
There, in that fondly sought-for, broad space,
flit about gazelles in the shape of handsome boys.
Ah! when they show themselves to those who are in love, they who are sad and care-worn,
How many hearts have been afflicted and how many robbed of their senses in the Court-yard of the mosque.[1]

[1] Ibn Khall., Vol. I, p. 391; about Abū Ayyūb-ul-Mūriyānī and his relations with Saffāḥ Fakhrī, p. 207; about Rabī Ibn Yūsuf. Vazir of Mansūr. Fakhrī, p. 210. There is a curious story related in De Gooje, Frag. Hist. Arab, p. 104. *Tr.*

The old Islam had, as we see, lost its exclusiveness by contact with foreign religious systems. It had not become more tolerant, but the ruling classes had become more indifferent. The old hatred of the Arabs against everything foreign had disappeared by the preponderating Persian influence. The treasures of Greek literature had been brought to the Arabs through the Syrians and Christians, and there suddenly arose among all active and intellectual men an intense passion for the study of the "ancients", *i.e.*, Greek authors. An author, living at the time of Ma'mūn,[1] says :—If we had not possessed the works of the "ancients" with their wisdom embalmed and immortalized, and the lessons of history preserved and recorded in them, which enable us to see the past unrolled and unfolded before us, and not only secure for us admission (into the realms of knowledge) which otherwise would have remained closed for us, but also enrich the stock of our knowledge with the wealth of their experiences, we would never be likely to obtain what we do obtain through them. So, indeed, our stock of knowledge, unaided or unassisted by them, would be exceedingly poor and the means of acquiring it extremely slender. Were we thrown entirely on our own resources and upon the results of our own experiences, our knowledge would assuredly be extremely limited and we would necessarily lose courage. The same author, it must be observed, adds : " More useful, more sublime, and more edifying than these books are those which contain direction in the path of salvation and mercy and teach us the knowledge of all wisdom, all sins and all virtues."

[1] Jāḥiḍh, Kitābul Hayawā.

From the study of the "ancients", which brought many new conceptions and ideas into the intellectual horizon of the Muslims, there were developed the Arab schools of philosophy which soon took a theosopho-mystic turn; while the orthodox Islam sought more and more to develop a firm and exclusive dogmatic system. The philosophic studies of the Arabs rested pre-eminently on Aristotle, and it was through the Arabs, as is well known, that mediæval Europe was introduced to the writings of the great Stagirite philosopher. Nevertheless the Platonic philosophy, notably in its neo-Platonic form, also counted adherents among the Arabs. Out of it has arisen among them a peculiar school of philosophy, which has been unfortunately hitherto neglected, but which cannot be left unnoticed here, since it has by incorporating foreign religious ideas into its system contributed profoundly to the latest shape, which Islam has taken through the instrumentality of Ṣūfism.

This Platonic school is known among the orientals as Ishrāqī."[1] Its most famous and zealous champion, whose works have partially come down to us, is Sahrawardī. He has woven the neo-Platonic ideas, with the aid of the *doctrine of Light* or Illumination, which belongs to the Zoroastrian or probably Manichæan faith, into a conception of the world alike original and fantastic. His doctrines, which had been well-nigh forgotten in nearer Asia, found great diffusion in India, where even two centuries ago they counted a large number of

[1] *Cf.* Debistān, p. 202, Vol. III; Gesch. der herrach. Idem. Kitābu-l-Hayawān, pp. 95, *et seq.* This idea of pure and impure Light is doubtless of Manichæan origin. [See Ibn Khall., Vol. IV, p. 153, *et seq.*; Dugat, Hist. des Philosophes, p. 189. Nöldeke on the derivation and early use of the word Ṣūfī. Z.D.M.G. XLVIII, p. 45. *Tr.*]

adherents. They look upon the *Light* as the type of the primitive creation, and divide it into pure, absolute *Light* in which there is not the smallest shade or darkness, and the impure *Light* which is partially blended with darkness.

Not without reason, we may associate the name of Sahrawardī with the last but great transformation which Islam has suffered by the workings of foreign religious ideas in the form of Ṣūfism or mystic philosophy. Considering the obscurity which prevailed till very lately over the genesis of Ṣūfism it would not be futile to offer some observations on this question. I wish to show that the real Ṣūfism, as it finds expression in the various orders of the Dervishes, which I sharply distinguish from the simple, ascetic movement which appeared in the earliest Christianity and even in the earliest Islam, owes its origin mainly to the school of Indian Philosophy, which is known as that of the Vedanta school. The proof that I will adduce is based upon enquiries and research. It reveals a new link in the chain of causes, which reconcile and harmonize with one another the various apparently conflicting systems of Eastern culture. To be absolutely precise I shall here follow the path which I have invariably pursued in my studies. With the growth of the ecstatic and rapturous tendencies, numerous orders of Dervishes sprang up in Islam. Every one of these orders of the Dervishes had its own secret rules and procedures disclosed only to the initiated. They were mainly concerned with the mode of bringing about mystic ecstasy. In one order of Dervishes continuous meditation in a separate dark room was accompanied by severe fasting and castigation; in another, litanies were chanted until by exhaustion the senses vanished and visions presented

themselves; in the third, dances and movement of the body were enjoined with musical accompaniments and singing of hymns. There is very little trustworthy information, however, about these secret rules of the various orders, and in the entire mystic literature, which has grown so luxuriantly on these secret rules and procedures, a remarkable reticence is observed.

I have happily alighted upon a text which contains the rules of the Naqshbandī order, and which gives precise information as to how, according to the rules of this order, spiritual exercise is to be undertaken and conducted for the purpose of producing ecstasy in the Dervish, and thereby enabling him to indulge in the contemplation of the spiritual world.

I place here the passage which has for its subject Dhikr, the common litany by which the Naqshbandī Dervishes believe they attain the greatest ecstatic raptures and convulsions: "The place of the heart is the mass of flesh under the left breast and that of the spirit, the mass under the right breast. That of the secret is to the left of the chest and that of the hidden, to the right of it,[1] and the most hidden is in the middle of it.[2] The Soul is in the brain, and the elements are unfolded therein. Each of these places is the place of the Dhikr in order! The way to commemorate [Dhikr] the name of the essence with the heart is by letting the tongue stick to the roof of the mouth, letting the breath go without

[1] The secret is, according to the Ṣūfīs, a part of the human composition. Some placed it between the heart and the spirit, others, after the spirit. Sprenger, Dict. of Technical Terms, p. 653 end. *Tr.*

[2] Some did not distinguish between the Hidden and the Most Hidden. Sprenger, p. 542. *Tr.*

15—1903B

hindrance.[1] While the teeth close on each other, then let the name of the Divine Being with its meaning be imagined in the heart. For that meaning is the pure unmixed Essence of God Most High, such as is signified by the faith in Him. Next he is to utter the formula of negation and affirmation 'Lā ilāhā illa 'llāh.' The mode is to let the tongue adhere as before and restrain the breath under the navel, whence he is to imagine lā[2] as reaching to the extremity of the brain and ilāha as thence to the right shoulder and illa 'llāh as thence to the heart; so that this formula should compass all the seats of the delicate constituents of man. After this he is to imagine *Mohammadun-rasūlu-llāh*, meaning thereby, that he is constrained to follow Mohammed. This he is to repeat so long as his breath holds out, and he is to let it go from his mouth in separate words, and then he is to say, 'O God! Thou art my aim and Thy pleasure is my quest', which we have shown above to be what he imagines after each commemoration of lā ilāhā, etc. When the person who is praying the Dhikr pauses, he should start on a fresh breath, but be careful between the breathings that his heart does not flag, but that the imagination should remain as before, lest there be a breach in the continuity. When the numbers reach 21, the consequence becomes apparent, which is the absorption and self-effacement of which the Shaikhs tell.[3] When he aims at complete unconsciousness and the

[1] *I.e.*, the seat of the Dhikr or commemoration in the process that is to be described is transferred to more and more subtle portions of the human being. *Tr.*

[2] Probably he is to think of the actual Arabic letters. In the case of Allāh alone he had to think of both the word and its meaning. *Tr.*

[3] These words seem to be corrupt. *Tr.*

preliminaries of extinction (fanā') appear, then he may utter with his tongue Lā ilāhā illa-llāh with the proper arrangement.

The smallest number of times this is to be repeated is 5,000 in the hour. The attainment of complete extinction brings with it the attainment of the first step in the lower *sainthood*, and this remains constant by God's help.''[1]

From this extract, which gives a tolerably good account of the style of the Arab and Persian mystics, we learn that an essential condition of the performance of *Dhikr* is the holding back of the breath in a particular way, and, as it is said indeed, under the navel; then the reciting of the formula of prayer a fixed number of times in one breath,[2] and then the adding of the second portion of the Muslim Creed, which contains the name of the Prophet, when the novice comes to an unequal number. Another peculiarity which strikes our attention is that the breath is to be directed towards a particular portion of the body, a physical impossibility, which only such enthusiasts as the oriental mystics can find faith in. Little importance, however, would be attached to these peculiar ideas, which attract our attention in the catechism of the Naqshbandī Dervishes, had they been found only among them and in no other orders. But among the Qādirī order of Dervishes, which is older than that of the Naqshbandī by about a couple of centuries, we notice the very same rules about the holding back of the breath. The procedure of the Qādirī Dervishes lays down that

[1] The rules obtaining currency among the Naqshbandī about Dhikr will be found in the Mukhtasaru l-Wilayah of Samarqandī (d. 791 A.H.), Vienna MS. [I am indebted to Prof. Margoliouth for the translation of this passage. S. K. D.]

[2] It will be seen from the above extract that this is inaccurate. Tr.

during Dhikr, the person performing Dhikr is to suppress with his hands every root of external thought, and hold back the breath until the internal senses are revealed.[1] From various passages in oriental works we see that these mystics believed that holding back the breath artificially conferred supernatural powers, and was a protection against dangers of every sort and even death itself.[2] The great encyclopædic work Nafā'isu-l-funū,[3] contains most instructive information on this subject. I place here the following passage:—

"*The Ninth and Tenth Sections.*"—The sciences of breathing and imagination. The first deals with the movements of the breath and their symptoms; the second with the constraining of imagination and the mode of controlling it. The Indians value these two sciences very highly, and whenever anyone attains perfection in them they call him a *jogi* and reckon him among the holy spirits. The founder of these two sciences, so they say, is Kâmâk Dyw. They call spiritual beings Dyw, and they assert that Kâmâk is still alive, living in a cave in the town of Kâmru. They make pilgrimage to this cave for their concerns, and some even assert that they have actually seen him. The king of this land sends daily to this cave rich food and splendid perfumes, which are placed at the mouth of it, whence they immediately disappear. These two sciences are exhaustively discussed in the book of Kâmru and Hagâsaka, which is held among

1 *Cf.* my paper: Mollah Shâh et Le Spiritualisme Oriental. Journ. Asiat. 1889.

2 *Cf.* Pers. MSS. in Von Kremer's possession.

3 The author of this work is probably Maḥmūd Āmulī who died in the year 753 A.H.

them in great honour. Every one of these sciences will be discussed here in one section.

I. On the Science of Breathing

"Know that breath comes now from the right and now from the left side, as it comes from the two sides at one and the same time. They connect the right side with the sun, the left with the moon. They also assert that in the course of twenty-four hours 21,600 breaths are drawn, in every hour about 900. Not infrequently 900 breaths, more or less, are drawn in one hour. They say that frequently as many as 1,600 breaths are drawn in an hour, and that every two hours the breath comes from a different place. Not uncommonly for two or three days breath comes from one and the same place. There are some *jogis* who in the course of 24 hours breathe only twice; once in the morning and once in the evening, and they assert, that just as it is possible to restrain the breath to that extent, *i.e.*, for half the day, so it is possible to restrain it for six months. If one succeeds in holding his breath to that extent, they think it to be the best means of preserving life, avoiding illness and attaining happiness." This information on the superstitious beliefs of the Indians as regards the holding in the breath is supported by another authority. In Dabistān it is said of the Indian *jogis* :—"Among them the restraining of the breath is held in great esteem, such as was practised among the Persians by Azar Hushang and by the kings of those people."[1] Were we to pursue our enquiries further, we would find the very same idea about the

[1] Dabistān Eng. Tr., Vol. II, p. 130; also *cf.* Vol. I, pp. 79, 118, 111; Vol. II, pp. 137-8.

holding back of the breath occurring in a work of the Vedanta school, "the Vedanta-Sara",[1] in which breaths are even classified according to the parts of the body from which they come. This classification very forcibly reminds us of that portion of the catechism of the Naqshbandī Dervishes which has for its subject the restraining of the breath, the Dhikr, and the condition of the meditation (Murāqubah of the Persian and Arab mystics). Among other things, the peculiar mode in which the person during the meditation is to sit is mentioned, then the holding back of the breath, etc., etc.[2] Besides we find mentioned in this work, "the Vedanta-Sara", a spiritual exercise, which consists of the frequent repetition of a certain formula (*e.g.*, tat tvam asi—that thou art). Here then we have a practice very similar to the Dhikr of the Dervish, which is brought into a still closer connection with the Dervish litanies by the peculiar idea of the holding back of the breath. In the Vedanta school, moreover, we observe certain ideas and expressions which are found even among the later Persian mystics, *e.g.*, in Molla Shâh we come across the expression "the knot of the heart has been unloosened", which means that the pupil has attained initiation into the mysteries of mysticism and has commenced to see visions. The same phrase recurs in the Vedanta books, *e.g.*, in the Vedanta-Sara (p. 93), for it is written "the knot of the heart is rent asunder", *i.e.*, all doubts have been solved and set at rest. An expression which repeatedly

[1] Poley : Vedanta-Sara in the Sitzungsberichten der Wiener Akademie : lxiii, 1869.

[2] Compare the mystic treatise of 'Aziz Ibn Mohammed Nasafī : according to the Indian idea the most appropriate mode of sitting is in lotus-form, *i.e.*, with crossed-legs.

recurs in the Vedanta school is "he who knows that highest Brahma becomes himself Brahma. He overcomes pain, passes the stage of sinning and is freed from the knots of the heart (*i.e.*, from ignorance and deception)." This external resemblance between the two systems—those of the Vedanta and Arab and Persian mysticism—obtains a further confirmation by their remarkable internal similarity. Both are pantheistic and have as their subject the union of the individual with God, with Brahma. When we consider that this peculiar system of philosophy was developed among the Indians at a very early stage, that Sankaracharya, the founder of the younger branch of the Vedanta school, lived in the eighth century of our era, we are, indeed, constrained to ascribe to Indian influences the rise of that Muslim mysticism which appears so much later and bears such a close external and internal resemblance to the teachings of the Vedanta school.

In this we get a fresh proof of the great transformation which Islam, in spite of its exclusiveness, has passed through under the influence of foreign religions and foreign philosophic systems.

It is a startling phenomenon, indeed, that just as we observe the influence of Buddhism in the earliest days of Islam, so also in its latest developments traces of Buddhistic philosophy are clearly discernible. Buddhistic views partly transformed that Muslim mysticism which had for its source the Vedantic school.

The pantheistic conception of the world is characteristically common alike to the Vedanta school, Buddhism and Christian gnosticism. From this alone we cannot decide, with any degree of definiteness, as to

the source from which the pantheistic conception of the world, which we find in Ṣūfism and in the teachings of the theosophists of Islam, has been borrowed. But there are other ideas of admittedly Buddhistic origin. We notice among the later Ṣūfis a doctrine that is unquestionably Buddhistic. It is that the theosophist, sunk in mystic ecstasy and deepest meditations, perceives in a certain order of succession various coloured lights; a phenomenon that only disappears when he has reached the final stage of glorification, known among them as the colourless world (عالم بيرنگي).[1] According to the Buddhists, the highest state of mystic initiation is the condition of a Buddha, *i.e.*, man transformed into God; the next stage is that of Dhyâna (meditation, Murāqabah). This is the farthest point, one beyond which thought can no longer travel, and at that point the world is stripped of all forms. The second and the third worlds are designated as the worlds invested with form and colour. No less is the idea of the wonderful powers of the ascetics, the *jogis*, genuinely Buddhistic, and they have passed over into Islam evidently from Buddhism.[2] The doctrine of confession, which is imported into some of the orders of the Dervishes, is likewise unquestionably of the same origin.[3] The proof of the Indian origin of that Persian and Arab system of philosophy known under the name of Ṣūfism, is to be

[1] See my paper on Mollah Shâh in 'Journal Asiatique,' 1869.

[2] Kaeuffur : Geschichte von Ostasien, Vol. II, p. 537; Lassen : Indische Alterthumskunde, Vol. III, pp. 387 ff. *Cf.* Journal Asiatique, 1867, April-May, p. 275, note 1. [Origin of Ṣūfism discussed in Prof. Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, pp. 418 *et sq. Tr.*]

[3] Gesch. d. Herrsch. Idem, p. 256.

considered as established, in view of the facts that have been placed in evidence, though it cannot be seriously doubted that Christian-gnostic and even Manichæan ideas have been largely worked into it. The earliest Arab Ṣūfism, the purely ascetic tendency of which is well known, owed its birth, in a great measure, to Christianity, but, on the other hand, the later Ṣūfism, partially indifferent to the tenets of Islam, nay even heretical in character, combined with neo-Platonic doctrines a large preponderance of Indian elements. Thus we are able to ascertain with some degree of definiteness the various changes that have come over Islam under the influence of foreign ideas. Christianity pre-eminently contributed to the growth of ascetic tendencies and laid the foundation of the theology of Islam and the scholasticism of the Islamic schools, which later on grew up with marvellous luxuriance. Manichæism, which enjoyed days of unclouded happiness under Ma'mūn, had a purely destructive effect, inasmuch as it fostered and nursed among Muslims religious indifference and scepticism: so much so, that Zindīq became a synonym for a free-thinker and an atheist. The idea of a Messiah came at an early date from Judaism into Islam and played an important part among the Shi'ites. The conception of a millennium and the doctrine of resurrection, on the contrary, are clearly of Christian parentage. These religious fermentations produced a free intellectual movement and awakened among Muslims the desire for the study of foreign culture: so that in a very short period many works of the Greek thinkers were brought within the reach of the Arabs through the medium of Arabic translations.

16—1903 B

The Aristotelian philosophy became an indispensable aid to Muslim scholasticism. On the other hand, the writings of the "ancients" made the Arabs familiar with the works of the Platonic school, notably in its neo-Platonic form, and under its influence a fresh school was formed, which became a rival of the Aristotelian philosophy and proved as perilous to orthodox Islam as the Aristotelian philosophy was favourable to it. This philosophic school, whose adherents bear the name of "Ishrāqīs", found its most famous champion in Saḥrawardī, whose tragic death earned for him great renown.

Buddhism and the doctrines of the Vedanta school introduced the pantheistic conception of the world, which notably in eastern countries, in India, Persia, and even Asia Minor, obtained constantly increasing popularity and called into being numerous orders of Dervishes.

So, Islam, in conformity with the universal law of history, has changed in the course of twelve centuries no less than the other great religions, and not a trace is to be found of that immutability which many erroneously regard as the distinguishing feature of oriental society.

But as in the beginning of its career Christianity exerted a profound influence, so now, when the shadows of evening are hovering around it, it is remarkable that Islam should on all sides be exposed to Christian influences, which bring to it the benefits of European civilization and prepare it for far more extensive and important reforms than all those which it has hitherto experienced. It would be a great error to suppose that the religion of the Qur'ān could be destroyed by the

introduction of such reforms. It is indeed too firmly planted and rooted in the people for that; but it is to be hoped that it may come out of this struggle more strengthened, ennobled and purified.

The more the Muslim is constrained to learn to adapt himself to the needs of the age and indeed learn them from the Europeans, whose powerful superiority he no longer fails to recognize, the more will he be induced to take the right and proper course, and that of a practical life from which he has been estranged by superstitious, mystic visions and theological speculations.

APPENDIX I

Von Kremer seems to be wrong in saying that Omar I issued a prohibition to the Arabs against *acquiring landed property or carrying on agriculture.* Wellhausen in his scholarly monograph, 'Das Arabische Reich and Sein Sturz', says that a general prohibition to the Arabs against acquiring landed property in the provinces never existed. Like the Prophet, his successors, Abū Bakr and Omar not excepted, disposed of crown-lands (Staaṭsbesitz) and granted away out of them (qatā'i') to deserving and distinguished Muslims not merely as fiefs, but indeed as *allodial property* ; in consequence of which 'Alī, Ṭalḥah and Zubair amassed great wealth. (*Cf.* Ibn Khaldūn, Proleg., Vol. I, p. 416.) During Omar's reign the Arabs were too much engaged in making conquests to think of the peaceful vocation of agriculture, and hence Wellhausen thinks that during the administration of the second Caliph such a measure on the part of the Government would scarcely have been needed ; or, at all events, even if the Arabs did turn their attention to agriculture then, its injurious consequence would hardly have been felt (p. 172).

Thanks to Juynboll we now possess the invaluable work of Yaḥyā Ibn Ādam on "Khirāj". He is one of the earliest Arab writers on the subject and is the source of authority of Dhahabī, Nawawī, Ibn Qutaibah, Ibn Athīr, Yāqūt and others. He died in the second century of the Hegira, and his death is placed in the year 203.

Ghanīmah, *i.e.*, that which Muslims acquire in actual warfare.

Al-Fai', *i.e.*, that which Muslims acquire by treaties.

Ghanīmah includes whatever they take possession of, little or much, be it a needle, *save and except land*, for the land belongs to the Imâm; if he thinks fit, he may divide it into five parts, apportioning four-fifths to those who have taken part in the fight, or, should he be so minded, he might let it remain as Al-Fai' for the benefit of the entire Muslim community—just as Omar did with *Sawād* (p. 4, Yaḥyā Ibn Ādam). From this passage it appears that as regards land won *in actual warfare* the Caliph, at his entire discretion, might keep it for the benefit of the entire Muslim community or divide four-fifths among the soldiers who took part in the war. Of course as regards Al-Fai' (*i.e.*, land taken by treaties or capitulation—land for which there was no actual warfare), it always remained for the benefit of the *entire Muslim community*. Even those lands, however, which fell to the soldiers, as booty of war, were never or very rarely actually given in their possession. For the sake of convenience they were allowed to remain in the possession of the original owners, who continued to hold them against the payment of tribute, which the State collected and distributed yearly as rents to the soldiers. Hence, the distinction between Crown-lands (Al-Fai') and land paying tribute to the State for the benefit of the soldiers became unimportant and purely academical; since the revenue of both the Crown-lands and land paying tribute to the State for the benefit of the soldiers equally flowed into the State chest.

Far from there being any prohibition to the Arabs, against cultivating land, the rule laid down by the Prophet prevailed throughout the provinces—" he who cultivates fallow land shall have ownership of it, and no one shall interfere with such ownership " (Yaḥyā, p. 63). Even Omar himself wrote to the people, " he who cultivates fallow land, he shall have the better title to it " (p. 64). This rule apparently applied to all Muslims.

There seems to have been two kinds of lands: Arḍhu-ṣ-Ṣulḥ and Arḍhu-l-khirāj. Arḍhu-ṣ-Ṣulḥ was the land which surrendered to Muslims by capitulation or treaties and paid the sum fixed by terms of surrender. Arḍhu-l-khirāj, on the contrary, was the land which surrendered by force of arms (Hidāyah, p. 205, Vol. II); and was subjected to the payment of khirāj (Yaḥyā, p. 6). As to Arḍhu-ṣ-Ṣulḥ, there was no objection to Muslims buying it, but as regards Arḍhu-l-khirāj it was considered improper to buy it, inasmuch as khirāj, when once levied upon the land, could not be removed, and for Muslims to pay khirāj was considered a degradation (Yaḥyā, p. 37). Omar forbade the buying of the land of the Zimmies (p. 38); for, said he, " do not buy the land of the Zimmies or their fields, since it does not become a Muslim to subject himself to the degradation of paying khirāj" (p. 39). This objection was deemed so great that when Ibn Mas'ūd purchased land from a Dihqān, he made condition with him that he should pay the land-tax, *i.e.*, the khirāj. But, on the contrary, if a Muslim inherited land from a non-Muslim father, he was permitted to hold the land provided he paid khirāj, *e.g.*, Ibn Sīrīn inherited from his father a piece of land and used to pay khirāj on it (Yaḥyā, pp. 8, 41). Omar and

'Alī used to let a man, on his conversion, keep the land in *Sawād* on his paying the khirāj on it (p. 43 ; *cf*. p. 51).

As regards Al-Fai', or *Crown-lands*, they were those lands which were originally the Crown-lands of the Persian Kings, or the lands of those who had been slain during the conquest of Persia, or those which had been abandoned by their owners, in fine, all unclaimed lands. Upon these no khirāj was levied. It was for the Imâm to decide whether he would let them out for cultivation subject to a portion of the produce being given to the Baitu-l-Māl, or to have them cultivated by hired labourers for the benefit of the Muslim community, or to give them away as *allodial property* to one who would be of service to Muslims (p. 8).

APPENDIX II

De Goeje : *Frag......Hist. Arab*, pp. 41-46. This passage is of great importance, as it sets forth the views of the Khārijites and shows how those views were met by the orthodox. It should be read along with the poem in Vol. XIII of the Kitābul-ghānī, p. 52, which gives us a very faithful picture of the views of the Murji'ah. "A number of the Khārijites rebelled against Omar II, in the year 100 of the A.H., under the leadership of Biṣṭām Ibn Murrah.' The story runs that Biṣṭām addressed his followers thus : 'O friends, you *have cut yourselves adrift from the general body of Muslims* [by

revolting] during the reign of this man who orders them [as their Imam] to act justly, and shows it in his own dealings and ordinances. Then act justly between yourselves and him [Omar II] and write to him to embrace your doctrines.' So they wrote to him emphasising the duty of obeying God and following His command and condemning wrong actions and the wrong-doers and *expressing their abhorrence against sinners and declaring them as outside the pale of Islam.* They then invited him to their faith and [proposed to him] *to renounce 'Alī and Othmān and to repeal the ordinances of Othmān and those of 'Alī subsequent to the decision of the arbitrators;* further soliciting him to allow them to send some one to assure him of their goodwill towards him. Thereupon Omar II wrote to the body of men who had revolted under the belief that [they had done so] in quest of truth: 'Now God the Almighty has not left mankind in darkness, nor has He thrown it upon its own resources, nor left it in a state of [mental] blindness. He has sent to it Prophets and Scriptures, and sent Mohammed to announce good tidings and to warn it from sins, and has revealed to it a book which is free from error; to which falsehood shall not come from before it or from behind it ' (Rodwell, Qur'ān, p. 199) —a revelation from the wise and praiseworthy, and he has taught it what it should do and what it should fear!

" So I charge unto you to fear God and be thankful for His graces and [implore you] to rely upon Him, for he who fears God to him ' will He grant a prosperous issue and will provide for him.' (Rodwell, p. 474). Your message has reached me and so your invitation, but ' who more impious than he who, when called to Islam,

deviseth falsehood concerning God ' (Rodwell, p. 446); and he who is called to truth but heeds not is a loser, and you have mentioned the graces of God towards men and His command to obey Him. ' Peremptory proof is God's ' (Rodwell, p. 358). You ask me, moreover, to act justly and uphold justice. Verily in truth there is a contentment and a salvation for him who acts in conformity with it. ' To every prophecy there is a set-time ' (Rodwell, p. 349). I am at one with you as to what you ask for and with God is success. *You ask me to repeal what has been ordained by the Imams who lived in the early days of Islam except the ordinances of Abū Bakr and Omar and those of 'Alī prior to the incident of the arbitration [at the Dūmatu-l-Jandal]* (*cf.* Brünnow, Die Charidschiten, p. 11). *Now the Imams who succeeded these were nearer to the time of the Prophet and his companions [and they accepted these ordinances], and God is a witness to these ordinances and knows them.* You are seeking permission for a number of you to come to me. Whoever desires it he is permitted to come, and to him safety is guaranteed. He shall neither be prevented nor in any way molested. Finally, I invite you to the path of God and that of His Prophet and to the fulfilment of prayer and the giving of zakāt (charity) and the going back to the fold of the church. Then I remind you not to oppose the laws laid down by God and the teachings of His Book and the precepts of His Prophet, for He has rendered manifest to you the path of righteousness and has shown you proofs [of the truth]. Then accept the biddings of God, and beware of heresies and fanaticism in religion and *interfering in matters which do not concern you.*" As is shown by

the following passage in the Qur'ān :—O Believers, ask us not of things which, if they were told, might only pain you ; for this is my way. I invite people to the path of God deliberately. If you accept, you will thereby please God, and if you heed not, then God will punish you, for who can escape God, and verily the vilest beasts in God's sight are the deaf, the dumb. And you *say 'arbitration belongs to none save God.'*

(لا حكم الا لله) ; '*true, arbitration belongs only to the great God, and 'what better judge can there be for those who believe firmly than God.'* (Rodwell, p. 546 ; *cf.* Al Fakhrī, p. 114.) "He sent to them this letter with 'Aun ibn 'Abdillah and Mohammed ibnu-z-Zubairal-Handhalī, and he told them 'these people have rebelled against us.' On going, propose *to them to join me and the general body of Muslims.* If they refer you to anything in the Book of God in conformity with which I have not acted, verily give them assurance, on my behalf, that I shall act accordingly. And if they refer you to anything in the Book of God which we know and they know not, then argue with them concerning it until they come round to your way of thinking. Then 'Aun and Mohammed went to them, and 'Aun said : 'O People, verily we have acted according to the Book of God so far as we have known it and have endeavoured to live up to it. Is there anything, however, that you know in the Book of God, which you can tell us? If that be the case, tell it. But if you are not aware of any such thing [then why have you rebelled against us?]. Is it *because you believe that you are free from error, while we should be nothing but a prey to it? Or is it that you despair of our*

ever knowing the truth; while you believe that you are in the possession of it? You believe that the sins of Muslims [who are not Khārijites] amount to infidelity; while your transgressions are mere sins.' In answer to this the Khārijites said: 'We consider sins tantamount to infidelity according to the Qur'ān; those who judge not according to what God has revealed, they are infidels.' 'Aun said: 'Ye are wrong in your interpretation. A man who does not judge according to the revelation of God, *because he denies the revelation*, such an one is an infidel. But a ruler who does not punish the guilty, but yet believes in the verse of the Qur'ān quoted above, cannot be an infidel. For God has said: "The unbelievers say, hearken not to this Qur'ān, but talk aloud therewith," and also He has said: "The unbelievers pretend that they shall by no means be raised from the dead," but Muslims believe in the next life. And the Commander of the Faithful is striving to act justly and to revive (the good things) that have fallen in desuetude. So fear God and reflect.' Then the Khārijites said: 'But the governors of your master commit oppression.' 'Aun said: 'Take charge of the governorships yourselves.' They said: 'We will not act for him.' 'Aun replied: 'Be then the supervisors of his governors, and whoever of them acts unjustly depose him.' 'Neither will we do that,' said they. Then the Khārijites read the letter of Omar and said: 'We shall send two men to confer with him. If he accepts our proposal, well and good; but should he refuse, God will take him to account.' Thereupon they sent a Maulā of the Banū Shaibān, called 'Aṣim, and one of their own number of the tribe of Banū Yashkur. These two went to Omar,

and he was at that time at Khunāṣirah. [On their arrival] Aun and Mohammed Ibn Zubair went up to him in his upper chamber. With Omar at that time were the daughter of 'Abdu-l-Malik and his secretary Muzāḥim (*cf.* 'Iqd, Vol. I, pp. 265 *et seq*). 'Aun and Mohammed informed him of the arrival of the two men. Omar then said: 'Search them and see if they have any weapons, and after having searched them, allow them admission;' and they did so. When the two Khārijite deputies entered, they said: 'Peace be on you,' and sat. Omar said to them: 'Why have you rebelled and what has displeased you?' Then 'Aṣim, who was an Abyssinian, said, 'We are not displeased with your mode of life; for certainly you are a man of justice and kindness, but *tell us of your authority to rule as a Caliph; it is by consent and authority of the people that you are ruling, or have you arrogated to yourself the power by usurpation?'* To which Omar replied: 'I have not asked the people to let me rule over them nor have I assumed it against their will, but Sulaimān appointed me without my requesting him for it, either in private or in public. On my appointment I took charge of the Caliphate, and *no one took exception to me save you. Is it not your principle to accept a just man as your ruler, whoever he may be?*[1] Let me be then that man, but should I do anything that is contrary to what is right and just, then you shall be absolved from allegiance to me (*cf.* Ṭabarī, 1st Series,

[1] The text is not quite clear here. It may also mean, "Is it not your principle to accept a just man as your ruler, and I am ready to do what is just to you?"

p. 2815; Wellhausen, pp. 214-5; *cf.* the speech of Yazīd Ibn Walīd, Al-Fakhrī, p. 160; De Goeje, p. 150). The Khārijites said: 'Between us there is still one question to be decided.' Omar said: 'What is it?' They said: '*We want your renunciation. You have acted differently to the members of your family* (i.e., *those who were Caliphs*) *and you have condemned their actions as unjust and you have pursued a different course from theirs. Then if you are in the right and they in the wrong, on you it is incumbent to curse them and renounce them.*' Omar said: 'I know that you have not rebelled for the purposes of this, but rather for those of the other world. But you have taken the wrong path [or rather 'you have missed the path to the other world']. Verily God did not send His Prophet to curse [the unbelievers], and Abraham said: Whosoever shall follow me, he truly shall be of me, and whosoever shall disobey me,—in that case verily Thou art Gracious, Merciful (Rodwell, p. 269); and God also has said: These are they whom God hath guided; follow therefore their guidance (p. 351). You have called the actions of the members of my family wrong and unjust. It is sufficient that these actions should be known as such. So ask God to guide you in whatever you do and *leave alone what is beyond you: for cursing sinners is not an indispensable duty.* But if you say—Nay, it is a duty; then I ask you to let me know when have you cursed Pharaoh.' The spokesman [of the Khārijites] said: 'I do not remember if I have ever cursed him.' Then Omar said: 'You can then dispense with cursing Pharaoh, and he was the worst of mankind and the most wicked of them. Can I not then dispense with the cursing of the members

of my family, and they were Muslims who prayed and fasted?' The Khārijites said: '*By their wrong doings did they not become infidels?*' Omar said: 'No; for the Prophet summoned people to Islam and all those who accepted the faith of Islam and its laws became Muslims. After their conversion, if any of them sinned he suffered the legal punishment.' The Khārijites said: 'The Prophet of God summoned people to believe in the unity of God and in that which was revealed from Him, and to act in accordance with his precepts. And if the people had said [in answer to the Prophet]: We believe in what has been revealed by God, but we reject your precepts; then this would not have been the proper acceptance of Islam.' Omar said: 'No one has ever said indeed that he would not act in accordance with the precepts of the Prophet, but the members of my family have deliberately done wrong to themselves by sinning with full and clear knowledge; for passion got better of their reason.' The Khārijites said: '*Renounce then those who have acted differently to you and repeal their ordinances.*' Omar said: 'Tell me whether you accept Abū Bakr and Omar as the rightful Caliphs?' They said: 'Yes.' Thereupon Omar rejoined: 'Do you not know that when the Arabs revolted, after the death of the Prophet, Abū Bakr fought them, shed blood, took their children prisoners, and seized their property?' The Khārijites said: 'Yes.' 'Also do you not know that Omar I, after Abū Bakr, returned the captives to their respective tribes on payment of ransom?' They said: 'Yes.' Omar then said: 'Did Omar I, in doing this, renounce Abū Bakr?' They said: 'No.' Omar replied: 'Do you then renounce any of them?' They

said : 'No.' Omar added : 'Inform me of the people of Nahrawān who were your predecessors. Do you not know that the people of Kūfah on their march never shed blood or seized any property, but those of Baṣrah who joined them, met on their way 'Abdullah Ibn Khabbāb and his slave-girl and killed them?' They said, 'Yes.' Omar said : 'Had those who did not kill renounced those who did kill?' They said : 'No.' Omar said : 'Do you renounce any of these two parties?' They said : 'No.' He said : 'You can then accept Abū Bakr and Omar and the people of Baṣrah and those of Kūfah, knowing as you do the differences in their actions and conduct, while you will not leave me any other alternative than to renounce the members of my family, notwithstanding the fact that our religion is the same. Fear God, for you are ignorant. You expect from people that which the Prophet of God has forbidden, and you forbid that which he has sanctioned, [the result being] that he is safe with you who is in fear of the Prophet and he is in fear with you who is safe with him [*i.e.*, who professes that there is no God but God and that Mohammed is His servant and apostle]. The person who professed this was safe with the Prophet; his blood was spared, his property secured and his rights established. *But you kill such an one and spare the followers of all other religions; holding their lives sacred and offering them security.*' The Yashkurī said : 'What do you think of a man who rules a nation, protects its property, metes out justice, but knowingly appoints as his successor one who is untrustworthy? Do you think that such a man has fulfilled his duties or acted as becomes a Muslim?' Omar said : 'No.' Then said the Yashkurī :

'Will you then commit the Caliphate to the charge of Yazīd after your death; when you know that he would not act justly?' Omar said: 'He has been *appointed by other than me, and Muslims are the best to judge, after me, as to the course they should adopt towards him.*' "[1]

There were two cardinal tenets of the Khārijites: (1) that any free Arab was eligible for election as Caliph; (2) that any Caliph who failed to give satisfaction to the commonwealth of believers might be deposed. (Brünnow, p. 7; Browne, p. 220.)

At a later date these two cardinal tenets, says Prof. Browne, were further expanded by the more fanatical Khārijites by the substitution in this formula of "good Muslim" for "free Arab," and the addition of the words "and if necessary slain" after deposed (p. 220, note 3). Brünnow is perfectly right in saying that among the pure Arab Khārijites of the early times the idea of anybody but an Arab being eligible for the Caliphate would have been impossible (p. 9, note 1). The Khārijites stood nearest to the orthodox party, inasmuch as both firmly believed in the principle of *election*, in opposition to the doctrine of hereditary succession of the Shī'ites, but with this important difference that the orthodox party would never have conceived of extending the principle of eligibility to all free Arabs.

The most distinguished Muslims of early times were Quraish, and it was to their interest to see that the highest office in the State should continue to be held by one of them. They even ascribed to the Prophet a saying relating to it: "*Sovereign authority belongs to*

the Quraish,'' but that this saying was an invention and that, among the Arabs, it was in no way accepted that the Caliph must necessarily be a Qurashī, is proved, in the first place, by the candidature of Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda, the Medinite, and in the second, by the Khārijites themselves, whose views could never have come into existence on Muslim soil had the saying of the Prophet quoted above been seriously accepted by the people. To understand this departure from the orthodox opinion it is essential for us to know the people among whom the principles of the Khārijites had their origin.

After the close of the Persian wars most of the soldiers who took part in it settled down in the two military colonies of Kūfah and Baṣrah founded by Omar I. They were mostly full-blooded Arabs of the desert. On their return home, rich with wealth, they devoted themselves more to the religious side of Islam. That the Khārijite principles grew among these people scarcely admits of doubt; since the Khārijites first appeared in Kūfah and Baṣrah. Almost all the Khārijites of the early times, whose names have come down to us, belonged to the great desert tribes, which were very strongly represented in those towns. Of one at least we know for certain; one who played a distinguished rôle in the Persian wars (Hilāl Ibn 'Ulāfah). The great insurrection against the Caliph Othmān possibly suggested, for the first time, to these Beduins, who did not know or would not know of any special sanctity of the Quraish, the idea that it was permissible to depose a Caliph who acted against the will of the community. We would in no way be justified, however, in tracing back the insur-

rection against Othmān to such an opinion; for, even if particular individuals did think in that way, they alone would never have been powerful enough to bring about such a violent revolution. But whether such an idea existed or not prior to the murder of Othmān, we are inclined to think that the accomplished fact must have brought it to the forefront. The murder of Othmān was, therefore, the cause rather than the effect of the Khārijite view that under certain circumstances it was not merely permissible to depose, but even to slay a Caliph (Brünnow, pp. 7-9).

I might mention here that, according to some traditions which we must reject, Mohammed is said to have prophesied that from the man who bore the surname of Dhu-l-Khuwaiṣirah, the first heresy (Khāriji) would start. This indeed was confirmed, for his son Ḥurqū was one of the first who left 'Alī at Ṣiffīn. According to the Qāmūṣ, Ḥurqūṣ was this very Dhu-l-Khuwaiṣirah. (Weil, Mohammed Der Prophet, p. 240, note 378). *Cf.* Ya'qūbī (Ed. Houtsma), Vol. II, p. 368. *Cf.* Van Vloten, La Domination Arabe, p. 31. *Cf.* Ṭabarī, 2nd series, pp. 1348-9. *Tr.*

APPENDIX III

The following extract is taken from the 'Iqd of Ibn 'Abd Rabbih. This writer, says Ibn Khallikān, was deeply learned in traditional knowledge and possessed great historical information; his 'Iqd or Necklace is a

work of much merit and contains something on every subject. (Vol. I, p. 92.) He was born on the 10th of Ramaḍan, A.H. 246 (November, 860 A.D.); and died on Sunday, 18th of the first Jumādā, 328 (March, 940 A.D.).

This extract contains most of the arguments of the Shu'ūbiyyah (or the partisans of the Gentiles) against the Arabs.

The Contention of the Shu'ubiyyah or the Equalitarians who hold to the Doctrine of Equality.

Among the arguments advanced by the Shu'ūbiyyah against the Arabs is what follows: We hold, they say, to the principle of brotherhood and equality, and believe that all men are of the same substance, and children of one and the same man. We adduce as proof of our contention the saying of the Prophet: "The blood of the Believers shall be equally retaliated or expiated (*i.e.*, the noble shall have no advantage over the ignoble in the retaliation or expiation of blood); and if the least of them should give a promise of security to any people, the whole body of the Muslims shall be responsible for its fulfilment; and they shall be one body, and a help to each other against all others." And also his saying in his speech at the farewell pilgrimage, in which address he bid farewell to his followers, and put the seal on his mission (or brought it to and end) :—" Ye people! God has removed from you the pride of the days of Ignorance and the boasting of one's ancestors. Ye are all children of Adam, and Adam is from dust. No Arab has superiority over any of the 'Ajam, except by reason of piety." These words of the Prophet are in conformity

with the words of God. "Truly, the most worthy of honour in the sight of God is he who feareth Him most." You, however, do not consent to aught save boasting, and say, They shall never be equal to us, although they professed Islam before us, and although they shall pray until they become like unto bows, and fast until they become like unto strings. But we shall act in a gentle manner towards you, and consent to discuss with you the question of the nobility of birth which your Prophet has prohibited you to boast of, but you have chosen naught save to act contrary to his injunctions. In agreeing to argue with you, we are also following his teaching and his precepts; and thus we shall refute your contention for self-glorification and say, "Let us hear what you have to say, should the Ajam put this question to you, 'Do you consider glory to consist all in sovereignty or the prophetic office? Should you say, 'in sovereignty,' they might answer you in this wise, 'the Kings of the whole world are of our number, such as the Pharaohs, the Nimrods, the Amalekites, the Chosroes and the Cæsars. Besides, is it meet for any one ever to have the like of the dominion of Solomon, to whom were subjected men and the demons and the birds and the wind? Now he was one of us. Or has any one had a kingdom like that of Alexander, whose power was established upon the earth, and who reached the rising of the sun and its setting, and who built a rampart of iron with which he filled the space between the mountain sides, and behind it imprisoned a nation of men who surpassed the rest of the world in numbers, for God saith, "Until Yājūj and Mājūj have had a way opened for them, and they shall hasten from every high land";

nothing can point better to their large numbers than these words? Nor has any man left behind him monuments like his on the face of the earth. If he had left nothing else save the pharos at Alexandria, the foundations of which he laid on the bottom of the sea, and at the head of which he constructed a mirror which reflected the sea on all sides [that would have been quite sufficient]. Of us, also, are the Kings of India, one of whom wrote to 'Umar Ibn 'Abdi-l-'Azīz to the effect :—"From the King of Kings, who is a descendant of a thousand Kings, and has as his wives the daughters of a thousand Kings, and in whose stables a thousand elephants are kept, and who has two rivers giving growth to the aloe wood and madder and the nut and camphor, the fragrance of which is perceived at a distance of twelve miles, to the King of the Arabs, who does not attribute to God any companion whatever. To proceed, my object in writing to you is to pray you to send me some one to teach me the faith of Islam and instruct me in its laws. Peace."

If, on the other hand, you say that there is no glory save in the prophetic office, we answer that all prophets and apostles from Adam himself have been of our nations, with the exception of four, Hūd, Sālih, Ismā'īl and Muḥammad. Of us are the chosen ones of mankind, Adam and Noah, the two stocks from which all men have branched off. We are therefore the root and you the branches; indeed, you are nothing but one of our offshoots. This being so, you may say what you list and indulge in your pretensions. And, besides, there have ever been nations of the A'ājim in every part of the world, with kings to unite them and cities to

gather them together, and with laws to obey; and a philosophy they have created, and wonderful things they have invented in the way of instruments and arts, as, for instance, the art of manufacturing silk brocade, which is the most wonderful of arts, and the game of chess, which is the noblest of games, and the weight of the steelyard by means of which a single pound or a hundred pounds can be weighed; and like the philosophy of the Greeks in their cosmogony and their law, and the astrolabe which shows the positions of the stars and by which a knowledge of altitudes is gained, as well as the movements of heavenly bodies and of the eclipses. As for the Arabs, they have never had a king to unite the country and outlying districts in one rule, or to curb the wrong-doer and restrain the ignorant; nor have they produced any result in art, nor have they effected anything in philosophy; the only thing they can lay a claim to is poetry, the laurels of which, however, the foreigners share with them, for the Greeks have wonderful poetry, perfect in measure and rhythm. What, then, can the Arabs boast of as against foreigners (*i.e.*, non-Arabs)? They simply are ferocious wolves and savage beasts, devouring and attacking each other, so that their men are ever secured in chains of captivity, and their women taken up behind the saddle-bags of camels, and who, if overtaken by the relief party, are rescued in the evening, but after having been trampled upon like a public road In fact, a certain poet boasted of this, saying, "Nor more trusted than I by the women carried off on an evening." "And is it a thing to boast of, woe to thee," he was told, "to rescue them in the evening after they have been outraged and

humbled?" The poet, Jarīr, has said, reproaching the Banū Dārim for the victory of he Qais over them in the battle of Raḥraḥān :—

" And at Raḥraḥān, on the morning when Ma'bad was taken in fetters, were your women wedded (compressed) without dowries?"

And 'Antarah has said, addressing his wife :

" Men have a way with thee, shouldst thou be taken. Thou paintest thine eyes with collyrium, and tingest thy fingers with henna."

" But were I taken, I would be yoked to the string of captives, tied behind the camels."

" Thy mount would be the camel and its saddle; but my mount on that day would be the hollow of my foot."

We also read that Ibn Habūlah, the Ghassānid, having taken captive the wife of al-Ḥārith ibn 'Amral-Kindī, was overtaken by al-Hārith, who slew him and took back his wife, after he had had connection with her. Al-Hārith asked her if he had had her, and she answered " yes, and by God, no woman has ever had a man like him." Al-Hārith, having tied her between two horses, made them run at full gallop, and she was torn to pieces. He then repeated the following verses :

" Count not on a woman's love ; for it is naught but false.

" He who is deceived by woman's love, after Hind [his wife] is but a fool."

And the Banū Sulaim carried off Raiḥānah, sister of 'Amr ibn Ma'dī-Karib, the horseman of the Arabs, who says in this connection :

"Is it Raiḥānah's cry I hear? It keeps me awake, while my companions are all asleep."

It is in this poem that he says :

"If you are powerless to do a thing, leave it to do what it will."

Al-Ḥaufazān raided the Banū Munqidh ibn Zaid-Manāt, and carried off Az-Zarqā, of the Banū Rabi' Ibnu-l-Ḥārith. She found favour in his eyes, and he found favour in hers; and he lay with her. Then he was overtaken by Qais ibn 'Aṣim, who rescued Az-Zarqā' and brought her back to her family, after he, too, had lain with her. Now, such were the customs of Arabs and non-Arabs in the time of Ignorance. Then God brought about Islām, in which the non-Arabs too had a full share; for the Prophet, peace and blessing be upon him, was sent to the red and the black of the sons of Adam; and the first to follow him were one free man and one slave. There is a difference of opinion as to who these were; some say they were Abū Bakr and Bilāl, while others allege they were 'Alī and Ṣuhaib. When 'Umar ibnu-l-Khaṭṭāb was stabbed by his murderer, he placed this Ṣuhaib at the head of the Muhājirs and the Anṣār to lead them in prayer; and on Ṣuhaib asking him to appoint a successor, he answered, "I do not feel as though I can appoint a successor." Ṣuhaib then mentioned the names of the six men of Ḥirā, he took exception to every one of them; and then said, "If Sālim, the *maulā* of Abū Ḥudhaifah had been alive, I

would not have hesitated about him." Thereupon the Arab poet thus expressed himself :

" Here is Ṣuhaib ; he led as Imām every one of the Muhājirs, and rose high above all the tribes of the Anṣār ! "

" He [*i.e.*, 'Umar] did not approve of any of them to act as our Imām,—and yet they are the guiding spirits and the leaders of all good men."

" Nay, more, had Sālim, he of the broken teeth, been now alive, he would have obtained the Caliphate of the whole empire !"

" These barbarians are ever alive and prosperous, but not we ! Verily the Arabs are blind and greatly in error."

Bujair holds the Arabs to scorn in the following verses, for their genealogical differences, and their adoption of men of dubious parentage :—

" You say that the Indians are the children of Khindif ; and that there exists between you and the Barbars a kinship ;"

" That the Dailams are descended from Bāsil ibn Dhabbah ; and the Burjāns are sons of 'Amir ibn 'Amir !"

" All men thus become sons of one man ; and all alike in origin of race !"

" Surely, the kingly race of the Banu-l-Aṣfar [*i.e.*, the Greeks] are nobler than you ; and worthier of our kinship are the Chosroes."

" Dost thou covet to enter into marriage relationship with me, when thou openly layest claim to false

parentage? What protection can one hope for from a bare-faced pretender? "

" Thou, in thy vileness, revilest his family and tribe ; and foolishly extolest Tāhir and the son of Tāhir."

I have reproduced these verses in a complete form in the chapter on Women, Men of dubious birth, and the Nobly-born.

Al-Ḥasan ibn Hāni' has composed the following verses, favouring the opinion of the Shu'ūbiyyah :

" I live among a poeple between whom and me the only ties of relationship are empty claims."

" When the head of the tribe calls me by the name of kinsman, I lightly respond to this ridiculous claim."

" The Azd of 'Umān ibnu-l-Muhallab raise their heads at first, when families are contending for honour ; but their pride is humbled at last."

" So Bakr think that the spirit of prophecy descended on Misma, while he was still a fœtus in the womb !"

" And Tamīm claim that none could be like their Aḥnaf to the end of time."

" After this I cannot blame Qais if they were to vaunt of Qutaibah ! Verily talk flows in various channels."

Answer of Ibn Qutaibah to the contention of the Shu'ūbiyyah.

Says Ibn Qutaibah in his *Tafḍhīlu-l-'Arab* [The Superiority of the Arabs] :—

As to the party of Equality, some of them have laid hold of the letter of some words in the Holy Book and in the Traditions, and decided accordingly, without

searching for the true sense of the words. They seized upon the words of the Almighty, "The most honoured of you in the sight of God are those who fear Him most," and His words, "Verily the Believers are brothers to each other, do ye make peace between your brothers;" and upon the words of the Prophet in his sermon during the farewell pilgrimage: "Ye people, God has taken away from ye the pride of the times of Ignorance, and their vaunting of fathers. No Arab is superior to a foreigner, except with regard to piety. All of ye are from Adam, and Adam is from dust." As also his saying, "The blood of the Muslims is equally retaliated, and the least among them shall be able to pledge his word, and they shall be a help to each other against their enemies." Now, the true sense of all this is that all believing men are alike before the law, and their positions are the same in the sight of God and in the life to come; for, if all men are alike in the things of this world, and no one is superior to the other except so far as the affairs of the next, there will not be in this world high or low, a superior or an inferior. What then is the force of the Prophet's injunction, "If the chief of a tribe come to ye, do ye receive him honorably," and his saying, "Pardon the faults of men of good position," and his saying with regard to Qais ibn 'Aṣim, "This is the Lord of the dwellers of the desert." The Arabs used to say, "The well-being of mankind is assured so long as they differ in degree; but when they become equal in rank to one another, they perish," meaning by this that their condition will continue to be flourishing, so long as there are among them people of high degree and good men, but that were they to be made as people of one class, they

would be ruined. And when the Arabs wish to depreciate a people, they say 'they are as like to each other as the teeth of the ass.' Indeed, how can men be alike in merit, when things in man's own body, the limbs, are not on an equality, and the joints are not the same; but, on the contrary, some of them are superior to others, the head for instance, is superior to the rest of the body, for it contains the intellect and the five senses; and it is said of the heart that it is the king of the body; while some of the limbs are servants and others are served. Ibn Qutaibah goes on to say: 'Among the weightiest pleas that the Shuʻūbiyyah have preferred against the Arabs is to vaunt the fact that Adam is one of them, and they cite these words of the Prophet, 'Do not place me above him, for I am only one of his many excellences.' They also glory in that all the prophets are of the non-Arabians, with the exception of four, Hūd, Ṣāliḥ, Ismāʻīl and Muḥammad; and they adduce as proof these words of the Almighty, "God has chosen Adam and Noah and the family of Abraham and the family of ʻImrān above all men, descendants one from the other, and God is all-hearing, all-knowing." Again, they vaunt of Isaac, son of Abraham, and that he is son of Sarah; and say that Ismāʻīl is the son of a slave-girl called Hājar; and this is what their poet has said :—

"In a country wherein ʻUkn has not attached a rope nor pitched a tent, nor ʻAkk nor Hamdān;"

"Nor have Jarm or Nahd a habitation therein. It is the dwelling place of the children of the Free; a land wherein Chosroes built his abode and in which not a man of the son of the *Lakhnā'* [slave] is to be found."

The children of the free, according to them, are the Persians; and the sons of the *Lakhnā'* in their opinion, the Arabs, as being descendants of Hājar who was a slave. But they are wrong in this interpretation, for it is not every slave that can be called *lakhnā'*. That slave-girl is called *lakhnā'* who is employed to do menial service, such as the tending and watering of camels and the gathering of fuel; the word being derived from *al-lakhn*, which means 'stinking smell,' for we say of a water-skin *lakhnā*, *i.e.*, it has become rancid. As for a woman like Hājar, whom God has purified of all stain, and approved of her as wife to his friend [*i.e.*, Abraham], and as mother to Ismā'īl and Muḥammad, the pure, whom he made to descend from her, it behoves not a heathen to call her *lakhnā'*, how much less a Muslim.'

The reply of the Shu'ūbiyyah to Ibn Qutaibah.

One of those who affect the opinion of the Shu'ūbiyyah thus replies to Ibn Qutaibah's argument as to the differences in the ranks of men and of some being superior to others, and there being liege lords and vassals among them :—

We do not deny that men are of different classes and that they differ in merit, and that some are superior and some inferior to others, and some noble and others of low degree; but we contend that these differences among men do not arise from their ancestry or lineage, but, on the contrary, from their own deeds and personal character, and from their nobility of soul and high-mindedness. Do you not see that if a man were of a mean spirit and devoid of manliness, he cannot attain a noble position even though he were of the noblest of the

families of the Banū Hāshim and of the best family of Umayyah, and although he should be of the best stock of Qais? Indeed, he is noble whose deeds are noble, and he is of high degree whose spirit is high; and this is the meaning of the Prophet's words 'If the chief of a tribe come to ye, do you receive him with honours' and of his saying, speaking of Qais ibn 'Aṣim, 'This is the lord of the dwellers in tents.' He spoke of him in this way for the high position he had acquired among his tribesmen for his defence of their womenfolk and his liberality to all. Do you not see that 'Amir ibnu-t-Ṭufail, who was of the noblest family in Qais says:—

"Although I am the son of the lord of 'Amir and her warrior famous in every fight."

"'Amir has not made me her lord by right of heritage. God forbid that I should rise through father or mother!"

"But (it is because) I defend her sanctuary, prevent any injury to her, and repulse the attacks of her enemies."

Another poet has said:—

"Although our descent is noble, we do not rely upon lineage."

"We build as our forefathers built, and we do the like of what they did."

And Quss ibn Sā'idah has said, "I shall give a judgment amongst the Arabs, which no one has ever judged before me, nor will any one dare to set it aside after me. If a man reproaches another for a blemish redeemed by his personal nobility, no blame can attach to him, but whoever says claim to nobility being of a vile

nature, does so in vain.'' Similar to this is the saying of 'A'ishah, Mother of the Believers, '' A man of noble race, if base, should be considered a man of base origin, but a man of base origin, if of noble spirit, should be considered a man of good birth ; '' she means by this that a man ought to be judged by his own disposition and qualities ; if these are good, the baseness of his origin does him no injury whatever ; and if they are bad, the nobility of his origin does him no good whatever. The poet says :—

> '' It is the soul of ' Iṣām that has ennobled 'Iṣām.
> '' And taught him to advance boldly to the fight,
> '' And has made of him a great lord.''

And a certain man made in the presence of 'Abdu-l-Malik ibn Marwān a speech which was full of eloquence. Charmed with what he had heard, 'Abdu-l-Malik asked him, ' Whose son art thou, O youth?' said he, 'I am the son of myself, O Prince of the Faithful ; for it is by my mind that I have acquired this position near you.' ' Thou are right,' was the reply. The Prophet has said, ' The pedigree of a man is his wealth, and his nobility is his religion.' And 'Umar Ibn-l-Khaṭāb has said, ' If you have wealth, you have distinction, and if you have religion, you have nobility.' Indeed, I have not met with a stranger case than that of Ibn Qutaibah in his *Tafḍhēlu-l-'Arab ;* for after exhausting all his powers in proving the superior merits of the Arabs, he finishes by expressing the same view as that of the Shu'ūbiyyah, thus demolishing at the end what he had built up in the beginning ; for he says at the end of his account :— '' And the most equitable view, in my opinion, is that all

men are descended from one father and mother; that they were created from dust, and to dust will they return; and they all pass through the uterus and are befouled by impurities. These facts should prevent men of sense from exaggerated ideas about themselves, and from pride and vaunting of their parentage; for after all they shall return to God, where their high pedigrees will be of no account, and their worldly honours of no consequence save one whose honour is the fear of God, and whose tie is obedience to His laws."

The Shu'ūbiyyah also say that the Arabs in the time of Ignorance used to take each other's women as wives, during their raids, without the marriage contract, and without waiting the necessary period to see if the woman was with child from her husband. How can anyone say who his father was, they say. Al-Farazdaq, in his eulogy of the Banū Dhabbah, extols them for their carrying off of women, and says in reference to a captive woman whom they had taken from Banū 'Amir ibn Sa'ṣa'ah.

"She fell to the ground and they held her in their embrace, and their only cover was their long spears."[1]

APPENDIX IV.

It is very probable, says Goldziher, that the five daily prayers, fixed by Mohammed, are due to Persian

[1] The translation of this verse is adopted from Boucher's *Divan de Ferazdak*. It is somewhat softened down. This is followed by another verse by the same poet which cannot bear reproduction.

influence. In a special treatise Houtsma has quite recently established that Mohammed had originally ordained prayer only twice a day, to which he later on added a third Ṣalāt (prayer), the middle one Al Wusta. To the proofs brought forward by Houtsma there is yet another which might be considered. Al-A'shā, in his panegyric upon Mohammed, assumes only two fixed times of prayer (V. 22; *cf.* Usdu-Ghābah, Vol. V, p. 148). For the 'AVr, after its definite establishment, there was needed a special recommendation. There was a sect of the Kharijites, called Atrafiyyah, because its followers acknowledged the duty only of performing the two original Ṣalāt, those of the morning and the evening, and rejected on principle the other three Ṣalāt.

For a long time indeed, as we know, questions relating to the number and hours of prayers remained uncertain in the Muslim community. If in the establishment of the three appointed times of prayer the example of Judaism was followed, might we not, on the other hand, suppose that the extension later effected from three to five prayers a day had been due to the five Gāh of the Persians by whom the early Muslims would scarcely have liked to be surpassed in the number of prayers. Z.D.M.G., Vol. LIII, pp. 385-6; Wellhausen, Prolég. zur ältesten geschichte des Islams, p. 17; Goldziher, Vol. I, pp. 33-39.

THE ARABS BEFORE ISLAM

I

The reforms effected by the Prophet can only be rightly estimated by a reference to the history—social and religious—of the Arabs before the introduction of Islam. Whether we regard him as a divinely-inspired Prophet or a bold and far-sighted reformer, no individual figure in the history of the East is so impressive as that of Mohammed. We have no desire to credit him with having started anything original. No such claim, indeed, did he himself put forward—others felt, like Mohammed, the hollowness of the worship of idols and even rose to a high conception of life, but they did not possess the moral strength to battle against old usages and customs, religious ceremonials and meaningless ritual which were closely intertwined with the Arab life and which could not be destroyed without shaking Arab society completely to its foundation. They felt the need of reform but shrank from casting the first stone at their established religion. Nor indeed was it a light task to break with the past and set at naught the old traditions deriving their weight and importance from remote and ageless antiquity. We are quite prepared to concede that Mohammed caught the flame from his contemporaries; but only one like Mohammed, burning with divine love and fired with holy zeal, could have assumed the mission, and undertaken duties involving such immense personal sacrifices. The rude polytheism of

Arabia, the grossly sensual and epicurean life of the Arabs, his higher nature could not tolerate. To destroy at any cost the existing *régime* became his absorbing thought.

It was a stake of life and death, but he threw himself into the conflict with all the force that was in him, only to emerge from it purified, exalted, fortified, and illumined.

Just about the birth of the Prophet and during his infancy, some of the higher classes in Arabia, dissatisfied and disgusted with the gross fetichism which passed for religion, were in quest of a higher religion than that which their country offered. Ibn Hishām relates in the life of the Prophet: The uraish had once assembled on one of their feast days round an idol (probably Al-'Uzzā) which they worshipped. They brought sacrifices to it and moved in solemn procession round the idol as they were wont to do, every year, on such a festive occasion. Four men, however, kept aloof from it: Waraqah ibn Naufal, 'Ubaidullah ibn Jaḥsh, 'Uthmān ibnu-l-Ḥuwairith and Zaid ibn 'Amr. One of them said to the other: ' You know, indeed, that your people have no longer the right faith. They have falsified the religion of Abraham. Why should we go round a stone which hears not and sees not; which neither can do us any good nor any harm? Seek another faith, for yours is no good.' Thus they dispersed to different countries in search of the true faith of Abraham.[1]

We read, moreover, of Abū Anas Qais ibn Ṣirmah and Zaid ibn 'Amr (one of the four above-mentioned) as having renounced the worship of idols in the days of

[1] Krehl, Das Leben Moh., p. 13.

ignorance.[1] We further read of Al-Walīd ibnu-l-Mughīrah,[2] and 'Uthmān ibn Madh'ūn as having forbidden the use of wine in the days of ignorance.[3]

The facts clearly indicate the religious unrest which stirred some of the thinking Arabs. It is no detriment, in our opinion, to Mohammed's prophetic character that the impulse should have come to him from his contemporaries. No reformer, no politician and no statesman can create new circumstances. He has to work upon existing materials and truly great is he who makes the right use of things and seizes the right opportunity for effecting his purpose. Arabia was ripe for reform, and Mohammed's greatness lies in the clearness of his vision and in the boldness of his resolve. The enormity of the task he was undertaking cannot be adequately measured by us at this distance of time. It was almost Herculean. It meant the entire subversion of the tribal system with its narrow ties and limited sympathies, the dethronement of the idols sanctified by age and tradition, the sweeping away of old and cherished ideals, and finally, what was most distasteful to the heathen Arabs, the imposition of fast and prayer and wholesome restraint upon the free, gay and unbridled license of social intercourse. Difficult and perilous as the task was, the inward power of genuine conviction irresistibly impelled the Prophet to grapple with the situation, to face and conquer the obstacles that lay in his path, and to nurse and ripen the growing spirit

[1] Ibn Hazm, Jamharatu-n-Nasab, Bankipore MS. Folio 119A, line 16; Folio 59.

[2] Ibn Qutaibah, Kitābu-l-Ma'ārif, p. 273.

[3] Ibn Sa'd, Vol. III, Part I, p. 286; Part II, p. 2.

of religious reform which, though limited in a narrow circle, was not entirely absent from Arabia. At first his preachings were neglected and treated with scorn and the heathen Arabs saw in him a crazed enthusiast; but as his enthusiasm waxed greater and greater, the opposition of the Arabs grew fiercer and fiercer. O! Abū Ṭālib, so they complained, thy brother's son reviles our gods, attacks our usgaes, declares our customs as barbarous, brands our fathers as heretics.[1] Neither force nor persuasion, however, could silence or destroy the Divine dispensation. In graphic and glowing language Krehl has described the beginning of Mohammed's Prophetic mission. We shall hear him. "The few words of the first revelation demonstrate two fundamental ideas which stand in sharp contrast to the religion of the Arabs—a senseless and meaningless polytheism. No one had hitherto ventured, on the one hand, to adjust the relation of the many gods to men, nor on the other, of the men to these gods. That they had at least a vague idea of the constant dependence of men upon a higher power is clear enough from the fact that they showed veneration to the representatives of that power, in forms and ceremonies inherited from their forefathers. The idea of the plurality of the gods necessarily involved a limitation upon the power of individual gods, since their power could not be absolute but merely relative. But the polytheism of the Arabs was incapable of giving satisfactory answers to the questions irresistibly pressing themselves upon every thinking person: whence do I come, to what end am I destined, has my life a purpose or a goal? There

[1] Goldziher, Muh. Stud., Vol. I, p. 11, and the authorities cited therein.

dawned suddenly upon Mohammed two fundamental religious ideas : God was the Lord and God the Creator, the Creator of man. By grasping the full significance and by making use of these two ideas, the foundation was laid of a real monotheistic religion, which appeared in strongest contrast to the rude and clouded notions of Heathenism concerning the relation between God and the Universe. The precise differences between God and the Universe occupies here, as in the Old Testament, the first place. No one could contend that this was a new idea. But it was new to Mohammed in whom it shot forth from deepest religious needs. With the assertion of this idea an important step towards reform was taken ; though as a matter of fact it was merely falling back upon an old idea. But its far-reaching and abiding consequence consisted in the fact that it gradually reclaimed the pepole from the worship of the elements, the forces of physical cosmos, and led them back to monotheism.

Shortly after the first, a number of revelations are alleged to have come to Mohammed. Thus the following verses of the Qur'ān, 'Read ! for thy Lord is the most beneficent, who hath taught the use of the pen, hath taught man what he knew not (Sūrah 94, 4 and 5), are in close connection with another verse 'Read in the name of thy Lord who has created, etc., etc.'

These words, according to Mohammed's ideas, involve quite a necessary consequence which flows from the belief in one God who has created everything including man ; *viz.*, that the created man knows nothing of his Creator or at all events does not know enough of Him and

that he must needs be taught of Him by revelation. Then further on, we find in the 74 Sūrah of the Qur'ān: 'O Thou enwrapped in thy mantle! Arise and warn! And thy Lord—magnify him. And thy raiment—purify it. And the abomination—flee it. And bestow favour that thou mayst receive again with increase. And for thy Lord wait patiently.' Here lies the summon to Mohammed to announce to others the truth which has come to him, to incur even risks and suffer for it, if necessary. Thus in these few words are to be found the germs out of which the entire Islam grew: the dogma of the Unity of God and the unity of the creation, the dogma that man is created by God, the command and commission issuing unto him to warn and to preach that which forms the contents of the revelation and to surrender himself patiently to the all-powerful will of one God.''[1]

Unity of God and the unity of creation: these two ideas were wholly opposed to the Arab mode of thinking. To the heathen Arab humanity or creation was an unknown and unintelligible quantity. There was no well-organized or settled society among them, and hence no corresponding duties to individuals as such. In that loose and ill-compacted society, the kindred group or the *hayy* was the social and political unit. Beyond this group there was no obligation, no duty, nor any sympathy either; their horizon was confined within this group. The bond which united the members constituting the tribe, was that of real or feigned unity of blood. The Arabs were incapable of realizing any absolute social obligation or social unity which was not based on kinship.

[1] Krehl, Das Leben Moh., pp. 59-62.

We have numerous instances of the "commingling of blood by which two men became brothers or two kins allies and the fiction of adoption by which a new tribesman was feigned to be the veritable son of a member of the tribe."[1] But besides those who were united by the ties of blood, there were permanent and hereditray dependants of a tribe other than slaves. Such were (*a*) freed men, (*b*) refugees out-lawed from their own tribe, (*c*) groups like the Jews at Medina who were not strong enough to stand by themselves. The whole country was full of such groups, and each group looked upon the other in the light of an adversary to be fought and conquered. Hence a continual inter-tribal warfare was the order of the day. The Arab poetry of the 'Days of Ignorance' has preserved a very lively account of such hereditary feuds, which were frequently carried on from generation to generation. For the success of Mohammed's teaching it was of the highest importance to supplant this narrow clannish feeling by a wider feeling of unity and brotherhood in faith. This he very fully realized. The earliest expression of this idea we have in the brotherhood which he established between the refugees and the citizens of Medina. "Become brethren every two and two of you," he said, and he set the example by taking 'Ali or as others say, Othmān, for his brother. Accordingly, says Muir, each of the refugees selected one of the citizens as his brother. The bond was of the closest description and involved not only a peculiar devotion to each other's interests in the persons thus associated, but in case of

[1] Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage, p. 62.

death it superseded the claims of blood, the brethren becoming exclusive heirs to all the property of the deceased. From forty-five to fifty refugees were thus united to as many citizens of Medina.[1] This feeling of brotherhood Mohammed inculcated by precept and example, and numerous are the sayings of the Prophet in which it has found expression.

How deeply-rooted the tribal feeling was among the Arabs is best shown by a story related of the Bakrite tribe. It is said that they were on the point of joining the Prophet, but hesitated to carry out their purpose on the following consideration. The religion of the grandson of 'Abdu-l-Muttalib—so they said—forbids those who accept it from carrying on feuds with each other. It condemns the Muslim (even if he belongs to a strange tribe) to death who kills another Muslim. Thus we have to give up attacking and plundering tribes which like us accept Islam. Let us, therefore, undertake an expedition[2] against the Tamīmites, and then let us become Muslims. This story very forcibly illustrates the tenacity of iron with which the Arabs clung to their old habits and yielded only after a long and dogged resistance to the general movement of humanity. By fostering the feeling of brotherhood among the Arabs, Mohammed prepared and trained them for the part which they subsequently played in the history of the world.

One of the frequent causes of the tribal feud was the glory and praises of ancestors, which the Arabs loved to

[1] Muir, Life of Mohammed, Vol. III, p. 17.
[2] Goldziher, Vol. I, p. 52.

dwell upon.[1] It seems that each tribe had its own poet to celebrate the praises, to chant the glories of its heroes, and to compose satires against the tribes with which his own happened to be on terms of enmity. These satires were a great force in Arab society. In the competition of the tribes for distinction, says Goldziher, the arrows came just as much from the mouth of the poet as from the quiver of the heroes, but the wounds which the poets inflicted sank deeper on the honour of the tribes and were felt for generations. In consideration of this fact, it is not surprising when we hear that the poets among the Arabs were not a little dreaded. We can best estimate the effect of such a satire, in pre-Islamic times, by remembering the power which it still retained even in those times when Islam at least theoretically suppressed and even officially punished its publication.

..................The satire of a poet might be of very serious consequence upon the position of a tribe in Arab society. A single verse of Jarīr (d. 110), lowered the reputation of the Banū Numair to such an extent that a Numarite, on being questioned as to the tribe to which he belonged, would not dare to give the right name, but professed himself of the tribe of Banū 'Āmir, out of which the Banū Numair had come. This tribe could be cited as an example of warning when a poet wanted to inspire terror in his adversary by the force of his satire. " My satire will bring humiliation upon you as Jarīr's did upon the Banū Numair."[2] The Prophet struck at the very root of this evil by condemning such idle boast of

[1] Goldziher, Vol. I, p. 41.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

ancestry and such Hijā " (satire). The Prophet's views are embodied both in the Qur'ān as well as in his parting sermon. 'O ye! Folk, verily we have created you of male and female and made you races and tribes that ye may know each other. Verily the most honourable of you in the sight of God is the most pious of you.'[1] 'O men,' said the Prophet, 'God has taken away from you the arrogance and pride of ancestry of heathen days. An Arab has no other excellence or superiority over a barbarian than that which is secured to him by his God-fearing and righteousness. You are all progeny of Adam, and Adam himself is of the earth.'[2]

The immediate result of the Prophet's teaching was the dissolution of the tribal system and the foundation of the brotherhood of Islam. We are far from saying that the tribal system completely disappeared from the Arabs after Islam, but it lost, without a doubt, its darker and uglier features. Under the Omayyads, the tribal feeling plays a considerable part in domestic politics, but in a very different form. The changes introduced by Islam are best described by Ja'far, the son of Abū Ṭālib, in his speech before the Negus of Abyssinia. 'O king, we were in ignorance, worshipped idols, ate animals which had not been slain according to religion, committed hateful things, violated the domestic law as well as that of hospitality, until God sent a messenger in our midst whose descent, love of truth, fidelity and continence we knew. He required us to worship God alone and turn away from the worship of stones and other idols which we and our

[1] XLIX, 13.
[2] Ante, p. 81.

fathers worshipped besides God. He commanded us further to keep our word, uphold the truth, love our relatives, protect the guest, abandon that which was forbidden, commit no wickedness, consume not the property of the orphans, tell no falsehood, and slander not virtuous women. He has commanded us to add no companion to God, to give alms and fast."[1] In this speech of Ja'far we have the whole situation most faithfully mirrored. It is further evidence of the fact that the contemporaries were not heedless of the change in religion and morals which had passed over them and which was mainly due to Islam. Mohammed's entry into Mekka was the symbol of the triumph of his religion. It was one of those few events in history which may be reckoned as an era or landmark. Arabia, hitherto insular and isolated, was now by the single genius of Mohammed suddenly drawn into the current of world-politics, the tribal feuds were silenced and extinguished, and a new world was opened before them. New ambitions, new aspirations, laid hold of the sons of the desert and, animated by a fiery ardour for Islam, they crossed the confines of Arabia conquering and to conquer.

But in order to realize fully the astonishing victories of Islam, we must proceed to the consideration of the Pre-Islamite religion and the social conditions of Pre-Islamite Arabia. It was not without reason that the highest proof of the divine character of Islam was seen in its marvellously rapid success. To wipe out, at a stroke, the gross polytheism and to substitute monotheism in its place and to set up a noble conception of

[1] Ibn Hishām, Vol. I, p. 219.

life and its duties, was a work which none but a divinely-inspired Prophet could have achieved.

II

The Arab ideal of life is best summed up in the beautiful lines of Ṭarafah.

" Were it not for three enjoyments which youth affords, I swear by thy prosperity that I should not be solicitous how soon my friends visited me on my death-bed.

" First, to rise before the censurers awake and to drink tawny-wine which sparkles and froths when the clear stream is poured into it.

" Next, when a warrior, encircled by foes, implores my aid, to bend towards him my prancing charger, fierce as a wolf among the Godha-trees, whom the sound of the human voice has awakened and who runs to quench his thirst at the brook.

" Thirdly, to shorten a cloudy day, a day astonishingly dark, by toying with a lovely, delicate girl under a tent supported by pillars."[1]

The Arab life was essentially a free, gay and unlicensed life of pleasure and frivolity. Wine, women and war were the only three objects that claimed the love and devotion of the Arab. He either indulged in wine, or carried on amours with women, or displayed his strength and prowess in tribal feuds, or in plundering his neighbour. It was a life of unclouded joy, neither disturbed by serious thoughts nor distracted by religious

[1] Sir William Jones, Vol. IV, p. 267.

contemplation. There was no fervid earnestness for truth, nor any firm and steadfast aspiration after goodness. It was the immediate present, which completely engaged and engrossed his attention. To enjoy the present and to win laurels on the battlefield were the supreme end of his life. Religion, with its chastening influence and noble ideals, never interfered with his imperturbable calm and sabbathless pursuit of gaiety. The Pre-Islamite Arab was an out-and-out epicure. And the Bedouin has to this day remained so. He is by nature irreligious.

He is practical and materialistic and stands by realities. Even so in his poetry. Wanting in imagination, he is not much amenable to religious mysteries that have more hold upon imagination than reason.

For the Pre-Islamite Arab, accordingly, Islam, with its strict religious observances and tolerably advanced morality, had but little attraction. Hence we have even after the complete victory of Islam, the silent but unmistakable opposition of the Arabs towards Islam, its doctrines, its ritual and its prohibitory injunctions.

Dīn, the revelation of God, upon which Mohammed rested his authority, and *Muruwwa* (manliness or virtue or in other words the ideals of Jahiliyya or Pagan times) come into fierce collison.

"Personal courage, unstinted generosity, lavish hospitality, unswerving loyalty to kinsmen, ruthlessness in avenging any wrong or insult offered to one's self or one's relations or tribesmen, these were the cardinal virtues of the old Pagan Arab; while resignation, patience, subordination of personal and tribal interests to

the demands of a common faith, unworldliness, avoidance of ostentation and boastfulness and many other things enjoined by Islam were merely calculated to arouse his derision and contempt.''[1]

The ideals of pagnism stood in marked antagonism to those of Islam. We have already referred to the intensity of tribal feeling in Pre-Islamite Arabia and its displacement by the larger brotherhood of Islam. We shall confine ourselves here, however, to purely social conditions, which offer us a rich field for observation of the pagan trend of thought that survived the triumph of Islam. The pagan view of life is embodied in the poetry of the Arabs, the most infallible index and the most faithful interpreter of Arab feeling and sentiment.

The pagan Arab still lurked beneath the thin veneer of Islam. He could not imagine Mohammed's prohibition of wine, which, according to the Arab, was the fountain of honour, virtue, bravery and generosity. It is essentially a heathen note, which Imra'u-l-Qais strikes in his poem :

> Thou art perishable, enjoy the world.
> Wine and beautiful women, white like the gazelles and tawny like the idols.

To get drunk, says Goldziher, passed even among virtuous Arabs as a thing little to be proud of. " Twice does he drink during the day and four times at night so that he becomes fat and of swollen face ; " thus the Arab reviles his enemy and of him, whom he glorifies, he sings that he does not squander his money upon wine.

1 Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, p. 190.

Barrād ibn Qais, the author of the two Fijār wars, was expelled by his tribesmen, the Banū Dhamrah, and later on by another tribe among whom he sought protection, because he gave himself up to drink and debauchery. We see from this that such individuals were not even tolerated among the Pre-Islamite Arabs. But to confine themselves to the enjoyment of the mild date-wine and to have to renounce wine completely and even to look upon its enjoyment as sinful and dishonourable, was too much to expect from the Arabs, who were inclined to anything but ascetic abstinence and who, singing the glories of their national heroes, in the days of ignorance, glorified the sparkling contents of the cup and used to express themselves in this strain :

" When I drink wine I set my wealth at stake and my honour is rich and cannot be injured."[1]

'Amr ibn Kulthūm says :—

"You see the miserly avaricious one when the cup is passed round to him, despise his property for it."[1]

We read in Al-Mubarrad :—

" When the cup has won power over me, my virtues come to light and my companions have nothing ill to fear from me nor need they be afraid of my avarice."[1]

The punishment imposed by Islam upon the enjoyment of wine did not at all serve as a deterrent to the majority of the Arabs and Bedouins who, in spite of Islam, were saturated with Pagan ideals.

[1] Goldziher, Vol. I, pp. 21-22.

A true type of such a class is the poet Abū Mihjan ath Thaqafī who lived at the time of Amar I. Thus he sings :—

> Give me wine to drink, O friend: well do I know what God has revealed about wine:
> Send me pure wine, with it let my sin become greater, for only when one drinks it unmixed is it that the sin becomes complete.
> Wine has become rare and even so we are deprived of it and Islam, and the penalty attached to the drinking of wine has separated it from us.
> A female singer is by my side; when she raises her voice she does it with coquetry.
> Now she sings loudly, now does she sing gently and hums like the flies in the garden.

In Pagan Arabia the true gentleman was he " whose hands were brisk in casting lost, when winter demands such recreation, a man censured for his disregard of wealth and for causing the wine merchant to strike his flags, by purchasing all his store."[1] And again says Ṭarafah : " Thus I drink old wine without ceasing and enjoy the delights of life ; selling and dissipating my property both newly acquired and inherited."[2] The same poet has well portrayed the daily condition of the Pre-Islamite Arab when he said :

If you seek me in the circle of the people, you will meet me, and if you seek me in the taverns, you will find me.[3] War and pleasures were the be-all and end-

[1] Antarah, 54. Sir Wm. Jones, Vol. IV, p. 305.
[2] V. 52, *ibid*, p. 266.
[3] Ṭarafah, 46.

all of existence and nowhere is the thought expressed in such beautiful simplicity as in the immortal lines of Ṭarafah :—

> O thou who censurest me for engaging in combats and pursuing pleasures, wilt thou, if I avoid them, insure my immortality?
> If thou art unable to repel the stroke of death, allow me before it comes, to enjoy the good which I possess.

Men nursed in such a gay atmosphere of life and accustomed to entire freedom in the pursuit of pleasure, would hardly relish the wholesome limitations placed by the Prophet upon their enjoyments. The prohibition of wine was one of those precepts of the Prophet, which the Arab, on the whole, always evaded and infringed. Not merely the praises of wine continue unceasingly in the poetry of the Arabs and Muslims generally, but we read indeed of a lively drinking society formed in the generation immediately following Mohammed, among the members of which we find the name of the son of the pious Abū Ayyūb-ul-Anṣārī. We hear from him the following wine-song :—

> Hand me then my cup and let alone the talk of those who reproach.
> Invigorate the bones whose end is decay and decomposition.
> For delay in handing me over the cup or in keeping it back is the very death.
> But when the cup comes to me it is my very life.[1]

[1] Goldziher, p. 27.

The prohibition of wine, though disregarded by a section of the Muslims, was one of those salutary measures of the Prophet which has saved Muslim society, as a body, from those evils against which modern Europe is now combating.

But the Arab was not merely fond of wine, his morality was also of a very doubtful character. The Arabs called wine and sexual intercourse: Al-Aṭyabān. Islam, however, would not tolerate unrestrained libertinism, and quite characteristic indeed is the story of Al-A'shā. It is related that when Al-A'shā was preparing to go to Mohammed to offer his homage to him, his heathen companions kept him back from his purpose by representing to him that Mohammed had placed restrictions upon the enjoyment of these Atyabān.[1]

The Arab sexual morality was at its lowest ebb in Pre-Islamite Arabia. "In old Arabia," says Robertson Smith, "the husband was so indifferent to his wife's fidelity, that he might send her to cohabit with another man to get himself a goodly seed; or might lend her to a guest as the 'Asir did up to the time of the Wahabites and as the people of Dhahaban must once have done according to Ibn Mojawir's account; or going on a journey might find a friend to supply his place, as the Yam did in the time of Burckhardt; or might enter into a partnership of conjugal rights with another man, in return for his service as a shepherd, as we read in the Fotuh al Sham."[2]

We read, indeed, with surprise of the Fizārite Manḍhūr ibn Zaban as having kept intact the marriage with

[1] Goldziher, p. 20.

[2] Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage, pp. 139-40.

his deceased father's wife, which he had contracted at the time of heathenism. This Manḍhūr, being accused before the Caliph Omar I of drinking wine, was forgiven by him after he had taken "forty oaths," that he had no idea of the prohibition. When Omar dissolved the incestuous connection of Manḍhūr with his stepmother, and prohibited him from further indulging in wine, he gave expression to the true heathen feeling when he sang:

> By everything that was holy to my father I swear:
> Verily a *Dīn* which violently separates me from Malikah is a great shame.
> Nothing troubles me any longer that fate brings unto me since I am kept away from Malikah and wine.[1]

It seems that the Arabs did not very scrupulously observe the laws of the Prophet concerning matrimony and the relation of the sexes. We have instances of transgressions of the matrimonial laws in early times of Islam, but they will not be soon conspicuous as those of a later age. Let us take one of the fifth century of the A. H. We read of Qirwāsh, who is specially known to us by his struggles against the Buwaihi dynasty, as having married two sisters at the same time, and when his conduct was called in question from the point of view of Muslim Law, he replied: "How much is there in our customs, which corresponds to our religious laws?"[2]

[1] Goldziher, Vol. I, p. 27.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

If such a violation of the Muslim law was permitted with impunity in the fifth century of the Hejra, we need scarcely marvel at the Hudhailites who made a request to the Prophet to impose no restraint upon sexual intercourse. In every sphere of life Islam effected a change for the better, nor were the early Muslims insensible of the immense amelioration wrought by Islam. We have already quoted a portion of the speech of Ja'far before the Negus. We shall turn to it once again. "O King," said Ja'far, "we were a barbarous folk, worshipping idols, eating carrion, committing shameful deeds, violating the ties of consanguinity and evilly ill-treating our neighbours, the strongest among us consuming the weak, and thus we continued until God sent unto us an apostle from our midst." And so indeed it was. Islam taught the Arabs purity of life and straightforwardness of conduct. It broadened their thoughts and widened their sympathies. It breathed into them catholic charity and rendered them God-fearing. It instilled in them virtue and valour, which made them the conquerors of the world and the models of knighthood. It emphasised the necessity of good living and right thinking, for says the Qur'ān, 'Righteousness is not that ye turn your faces to the East and to the West, but Righteousness is this: Whosoever believeth in God and the Last day and the angels and the Book and the Prophets, and whoso, for the love of God, giveth of his wealth unto his kindred and unto orphans and the poor and the traveller and to those who crave alms and for the release of the captives, and whoso observeth prayer and giveth in charity; and those who, when they have covenanted, fulfil their covenant and who are patient in adversity and hardship, and in times of violence; these

are the righteous and they that fear the Lord.' (Sūrah II, 178).

From gross fetichism to severe and unbending monotheism—such was the religious reform effected by Islam.

The natural history of polytheism, says John Stuart Mill, is now well understood. Religion though *ex vi termini* preternatural, is yet a theory for the explanation of nature; and generally runs parallel with the progress of human conceptions of that which it is intended to explain; each step made in the study of the phenomena determining a modification in the theory.[1] The early beginnings and the subsequent growth of Arab polytheism are shrouded in impenetrable mystery. But we have no reason to suspect that its course was any different to that of polytheism among other nations. In conformity with their intellectual development, their notions of religion must have been quite rude and simple, but when they emerge in the full daylight of history, we observe among them polytheism of the lowest and grossest type. For the pre-historic period, we have no certain or substantial data. Even this, for the present at all events, says Krehl, must remain undecided—whether the Semitic population, immigrating into Arabia from the North-East, accepted the religious worship which had existed in the country, or whether in consequence of foreign influence a new form of worship was gradually evolved and developed among the Arabs.[2]

[1] *Dissertations and Discussions*, Vol. II, p. 307.
[2] Krehl, Die Religion der Vorislamischen Araber, p. 5.

Ibn Ḥazam, in his Jamharatu-n-Nasab, says that the first to change the religion of Ibrahim and call the Arabs to the worship of idols, was 'Amr ibn Luḥayy.[1]

Whether they really were, originally, monotheistic or not, we are unable to ascertain. It is clear, that the idea of the real presence of God, obviously necessary for religious needs, was lost among them by the belief in God as being not only different but also separated from those in the world. But this need some felt among them, and some substitute had to be sought for it in Nature and its phenomena. According to their view, God revealed himself in the external visible phenomena of Nature. For the inhabitant of the desert, however, nature affords but few phenomena, which might powerfully work upon his mind so as to constrain him to worship them as evidences and manifestations of Divinity. Nothing was more calculated to draw and rivet the attention of the Arabs so forcibly as the stars. The stars, accordingly, became the symbols and emblems of divine majesty, immutability and permanence.

Thus arose over a large portion of Asia, from the extreme borders of Persia to those of Egypt, the worship of stars. It is difficult indeed to say whether the star-worship originated in Arabia or Mesopotamia.

But both Shahrastānī and Dimashqī support us in the view that star-worship was general in Arabia. Dimashqī says :—" The Arabs finally professed the religion of the Sabæans. The Ḥimyarites worshipped the sun (the history of the hoopoo and Queen Bilqīs, —*cf*. Sūrah 27, 20,—proves that she and her people

[1] Bankipore MS., F. 85 A.

worshipped the sun) but eventually, like the tribe of Kinānah, which originally worshipped the moon, were converted to Judaism. The tribes of Lakhm and Judhām worshipped Jupiter· Asad, Mercury, Ṭasm, Hyaden, Qais, Sirius, Ṭayy, Suhail.[1] But besides the star-worship, among the Arabs there was a rich diversity of beliefs, and we owe to Shahrastānī an exhaustive account of them. The religion of the Pre-Islamite Arabs, says Shahrastānī,[2] falls into various groups. Some denied the existence of the Creator, the resurrection and the return of man to God, and asserted that nature, in itself, possesses the power of giving life; but time, in its eternal course, destroys all individual beings. Others believed in a creator and in a creation called forth out of nothing, but denied belief in resurrection and the return of man to God. Others again believed in creation and a creator and a certain form of return of man to God, but disbelieved in the prophets and worshipped idols, whom they believed to be mediators in the life to come between them and God, and made pilgrimages to them, offered them victims for sacrifice and brought pious offerings to them. This was the religion of the majority of the Arabs. Others finally believed in transmigration of soul and maintained that after death the blood of the brain is united with some portion of a man's body, and out of this union arose the bird Hāmah, which returned to the grave of the deceased every hundred years. In this, however, all the Arabs agreed—that the posterity of Abraham, from the beginning, professed the very same

[1] Apud Krebl, p. 8. [2] p. 432.

monotheistic religion as Abraham himself. The departure from the religion of Abraham was ascribed to the influence of the Devil.

To all appearance the Arabs honoured the gods, went on pilgrimage to their sanctuaries, made sacrifices in the temples, anointed with the blood of the victims the gods carved out of stone or made of wood, consulted oracles when in difficulty and questioned them about the future. But all this was sham and counterfeit. Of real, genuine religious feeling there was none. A la moindre occasion on se fâchait contre les dieux, on leur disait comme il faut leur vérités et on les outrageait, says Dozy.[1] These facts clearly indicate that the Pre-Islamite Arabs were in a state of religious unrest just before Islam. Dissatisfied with their religious system, and unable to find any better which could satisfy their needs and requirements, they were in a state of religious indifference. They performed, indeed, their Pagan ritual, but a genuine religious feeling they had none. The presence of Christianity and Judaism accentuated the religious discontent of the Arabs, and exerted a decisive influence in turning their thoughts from paganism to higher things. Christianity penetrated into Arabia, so to speak, by two streams; one from the South (Abyssinia) and one from the North, and made indeed some progress. In Yaman, Najrān had become a Christian town at a tolerably early period. The Sinai Peninsula was almost entirely converted and contained a number of converts and churches, and the Arabs of Syria professed Christianity.

[1] L'histoire de L'Islamisme, p. 11.

23—1903 B

But in spite of all this, Christianity failed to strike a deep root among the Arabs. Central Arabia was scarcely affected by Christianity. In general, says Dozy, Christianity with its miracles, its dogma of the Trinity and its teaching about the Crucifixion of God, possessed but scant attraction or charm for the cynical and intelligent Arabs. We might recall the instance of the Bishop who, about the year 513, wanted to convert 'Al-Mundhir III, King of Ḥīrah. The king was hearing the bishop attentively, when one of his officers came to him and whispered something in his ear. Thereupon the king, all of a sudden, was plunged in profound grief. On the priest respectfully asking him the reason of his grief, he replied : Alas! What sad news! I have just learned that the Archangel Michael is dead. Impossible, said the priest. Somebody has deceived thee. Angels are immortal. To be sure, pertly replied the prince, and you wish me to believe that God Himself is dead.[1] Judaism attracted the Arabs more. A great number of Jews, after the suppression of the revolt against the Emperor Hadrian, took refuge in Arabia. Different Arab tribes, coming in contact with them, embraced their faith, and these were perhaps the only ones who were sincerely attached to their faith. Judaism was even for some time the state religion of Yaman. But Judaism did not fully satisfy their cravings. The longing for a better religion continued unabated.

Though the Bedouins were and have always remained irreligious, still there were, as there always are

[1] *Ibid*, pp. 13-14.

exceptions to the general rule. The influence of Judaism and Christianity reveals itself in a clear and demonstrable manner upon reflective Arabs. It opened in them a new and serious vein of thought, and we find traces of a profound faith in the unity of God and a consciousness of the responsibility which accompanies human acts and omissions in some of the poets of the sixth century. Those who thought in this strain were called *Ḥanīfs*, but they never formed themselves into a sect nor were they united by one common tie, nor had they one common worship like the Sabæans, who were also called *Ḥanīfs*. These two types of *Ḥanīfs* had, however, this much in common, that they both rejected Judaism and Christianity and professed the religion of Abraham. Their doctrine was simple and well-adapted to the practical Arab. *Ḥanīfism* would, undoubtedly, have become the religion of the Arabs; but it lacked a definite system, a strong organisation, and, above all, a divine sanction or something that might be taken for such. Devoid of the divine basis, which allures and enthrals humanity, *Ḥanīfism* did not, and as a matter of fact, could not, grow into the established religion of the Arabs. Yet in the history of religious belief it has an importance of its own. It served Mohammed as a base of operation and offered him a foundation to rear the magnificent fabric of Islam. It was reserved for Mohammed to repair the defects and to supply the imperfections of Ḥanīfism; but this task, difficult in itself, became doubly so, because the Arabs not merely did not perceive or realise the want of a religion, but had a pronounced aversion to religious ritual and mystical speculation. To accomplish this a firm conviction and unshaken faith were necessary.

To sum up. Islam gave the Arabs the purest monotheism, unalloyed with baser metal, impressed upon them the seriousness of life, struck at the very root of social corruption and pollution, destroyed their insularity and made them the heralds and pioneers of civilization. We cannot conclude this paper better than in the language of Professor Browne :—

"We have seen that, at the battle of Dhu Qar, signs of the immense vitality and potential strength of the Arabs—hitherto regarded by their neighbours as a 'negligible quantity'—were not altogether wanting even before Isalm; yet it was undoubtedly to Islam, that single yet majestic creed, of which no unprejudiced student can ignore the grandeur, that they owed the splendid part which they were destined to play in the history of civilization. In judging of the Arabian Prophet, western critics are too often inclined to ignore the condition from which he raised his country and to forget that many institutions, such as slavery and polygamy, which they condemn, were not introduced but only tolerated by Islam."

THE MEDIÆVAL CONCEPTION OF ISLAM

When we consider the intimate relations which existed between Muslims and Christians throughout the Middle Ages we, at the outset, find it difficult to account for the absolutely perverse and false notions about Islam which mediæval writers invented with lavish unscrupulousness and circulated with indefatigable zeal. But a closer investigation reveals the reason of this apparently strange phenomenon.

In the beginning, when Islam crossed the confines of Arabia, we see Islam and Christianity locked in deadly strife, but as soon as Islam had secured its victories, peaceful relations were restored between the cross and the crescent.

In the foregoing pages we have already discussed the social relations which existed between the Arabs and the Byzantines and the tremendous influence which Islam and Christianity mutually exerted over each other. The pacific and tolerant policy of the Omayyads was such as to smooth difficulties and allay passions, but it seems, however, that beyond the merest fringe of Christian society Islam was all but unknown and Mohammed remained, till recent times, a vague and shadowy figure in European literature. It would be perfectly idle to put down this dearth of accurate information on Islam and Mohammed to lack of opportunities for studying the life or the religion of the Prophet, inasmuch as the Byzantines not merely came in contact with Muslims,

but lived in the closest intimacy with them, and furthermore, since the first half of the twelfth century almost all the important works of the Arabs in philosophy, medicine, astronomy and mathematics had been rendered into Latin. This clearly shows that there was a large circle of men among Christians conversant with Arabic. In this connection stands first and foremost the name of Raymond, the Archbishop of Toledo and the great Chancellor of Castille (1130-1150), who organized a body of translators, appointing as their chief the Dominican Gondeslavi. Besides the Byzantines, therefore, "Europe came into contact with Muslims on the one hand through Spain and particularly through Toledo; on the other through Sicily and the Kingdom of Naples." In spite of the facilities for acquainting themselves with Islam, the Christians of the Middle Ages betray an appalling ignorance even of the very name of Mohammed. In mediæval literature he appears as Mophomet, Baphomet and Bafum. Moreover, for centuries, the Christians saw in him the God of the Muslims, who was propitiated by human sacrifices. It would take us too long to enter into the ideas held by the Christians about the Prophet from the account of the false Turpin regarding the golden idol, called Mahom, which he saw worshipped at Cadiz, to the time when the critics began to see in him something to justify his claim as a Prophet of God. We shall, therefore, content ourselves with the most important of them. There were, doubtless, as it would appear in the sequel, authors like Nicoldus of Monte Christo and the preacher-monk William of Tripoli, who rose above petty prejudices and

saw in Mohammed something better than an out-and-out impostor, but even the most liberal mediæval writer fails most miserably when he begins to expound Islam.

It is perfectly astonishing to read what Eulogius of Cordova, a learned Spanish priest, has to say about Mohammed. According to him the Prophet had announced to his followers that he would be raised, by the angels, to heaven three days after his death, but observes the erudite priest, "instead of this dogs devoured his rotting corpse." We cannot omit to mention that Eulogius lived a considerable time among Muslims and had every facility for discovering the truth, had he cared to do so, but he confesses, with remarkable simplicity, that all his knowledge on the subject is drawn from a Latin manuscript which came, by chance, to his hand at Pampelona.

Let us now enquire into the reasons of this singular ignorance or misapprehension of mediæval Christians about Islam and the Prophet. It was, to our mind, the result of various causes, but the key to the entire situation is to be sought in the dominating influence which the Church exercised over the people in the Dark Ages. The progress of Islam had aroused Europe to a sense of impending danger, and however indifferent the masses might have been, those who were possessed of clarity of vision unmistakably saw in Islam the most dangerous rival to Christianity. The complete realisation of this danger immediately set the flame ablaze, and the Catholic Church was quickened into active antagonism towards Islam. In its earliest days it seemed as though a trailing cloud of glory attended Islam, inasmuch as wherever its

banner was unfurled its victory was absolute and complete.

As years rolled on, dangers from the side of the Muslims pressed more and more upon Christendom, and clear-sighted men began to look around for a power which might serve to oppose the onward progress of Islam.

Ranke, with his characteristic historical acumen, grasps the situation when he says that "we ought not to consider the Christianization of Germany only from the point of view of religious belief and teaching. However important these may be, it was of world-historical importance that some counter-acting influence should be prepared against Islam which was pressing ever deeper and deeper into the continent of Europe. Boniface knew right well what had happened in Spain; the work of conversion which he was carrying on was the chief cause why the same events did not repeat themselves in Gaul and Germany."[1] The Church, fully alive to the dangers with which Islam threatened Christendom, would naturally be little inclined to treat it fairly. And when we bear in mind, indeed, the marvellous sway which she had over the life and being of mediæval Christians and the entire control over mediæval literature, our surprise vanishes and we begin to look upon the perverse and distorted conception of Islam which prevailed, during the Middle Ages, as the natural and legitimate result of the existing circumstances.

Not less unfortunate was the fact that Western Europe obtained its first and fundamental knowledge of

[1] Cf. Civilization, Vol. II, p. 175.

Islam from an extremely unreliable source—the Byzantines. That the Byzantines looked upon Islam with particular enmity and even avowed aversion will be readily understood when we remember that the Muslims had deprived the Eastern Empire of some of its fairest provinces and were constantly making assaults upon it. But even this fact was not so odious and hateful to them as the severe and unbending monotheism of Islam, which shone, with all the brighter lustre, by the side of the Byzantine Christianity with its strong taint of polytheism. Islam appeared to them in the light of a formidable rival and competitor against their religion. The Byzantines, however, owing to the political enfeeblement in which they had fallen, might feel but were unable to repel the onslaughts of Islam and the steady inroad it was making both upon their territory and upon their faith. With the appearance of the Turks as champions of Islam, at the time when the Caliphate of Baghdad had fallen into decay and decrepitude, there opens a new phase in the struggle between Islam and Christianity. The Western Church, anxious less for the integrity of the Eastern Empire than the extension of the Catholic faith, organized the Crusades ostensibly to avenge the wrongs done to Christendom by the Turks, but in reality to resist the growing force and strength of Islam. Ever since the days of Gregory VII the plan of hurling Europe against the East and bringing the infidels into the fold of the Church was silently shaping and maturing itself. Gregory himself had been foiled in his attempts by discords within the bosom of the Church. It was reserved for Urban II to carry out that bold

design and to pour forth an unending stream of warriors for the conquest of the Holy Land. In order to have a fresh levy of troops always at hand the Church was constantly engaged in circulating the darkest calumnies on Islam and its followers. Like an avalanche these accusations grew in each succeeding record. The picture that Theophanes had drawn of Mohammed was not bad enough for the diligent preachers of the Crusades, who now painted him darker and uglier than ever. Muslims were repeatedly accused, sometimes without the slightest foundation, of the most disgraceful and outrageous desecration of Christian sanctuaries. By stirring the temper of Europe to a deep resentment, the supporters of the Crusaders sought to keep alive the warfare between Islam and Christianity. A small incident which took place at the taking of Antioch is described by Raymond of Agiles in language which amply illustrates the feeling of intense hatred with which the Christians regarded the Muslims. Says the pious Raymond :

"Something pleasant and diverting occurred after their long tribulations. A troop of Turkish horse, more than three hundred in number, pressed by the Crusaders, were driven over a precipice ; a *pleasure to see, much as we regretted the loss of the horses.*"[1]

Before we pass on to the account of Mohammed, as given by the mediæval writers, it would be interesting to refer to the Arab version of the legend associated with the name of Buhairā, inasmuch as almost all the mediæval writers love to dwell upon the real or imaginary con-

[1] Sybel, History and Literature of the Crusades, p. 144.

nection of the Prophet with a monk. In Wāḥidī's Asbābu-n-Nuzūl we have this legend still in its undeveloped form. It runs thus: "Verse 46 Sūra 14 of the Qur'ān refers to Abū Bakr. When he was eighteen and Mohammed twenty years of age, Abū Bakr accompanied him on a commercial journey to Syria. They alighted, at a halting station, under a tree. The Prophet sat under the shade of the tree and Abū Bakr went to a *Rāhib* and questioned him about the true religion. The *Rāhib* asked as to the man under the tree. Abū Bakr answered: 'Mohammed, the son of 'Abdu-llah.' The *Rāhib*, thereupon, rejoined: 'By Allah! this is a prophet. No other than Mohammed, the messenger of God, shall sit, after Jesus, under this tree. This made a deep impression upon Abū Bakr, who became convinced of the truth, and never left Mohammed again on his journey homeward."

The tradition is found also in Mawāhib and Ḥalabī and is traced back to Ibn 'Abbās, the well-known inventor of false traditions, who died in A.H. 68. Iṣābah also mentions this story, but he seems to have taken it from the Tafsīr (commentary) of 'Abdul-Ghanī ibn Sa'dath-Thaqafī.

In these three works, which are of a later date, we notice the *Rāhib* bearing the name of Buḥairā. They mark the gradual development and the steady embellishment of this legend. It is doubtless the source and the basis of the wonderful accounts we read in mediæval writers of the connection of Mohammed with a monk. They gave, however, additional colouring to it. Let us

now see what Ibn Isḥāq has to say.[1] Later on Abū Tālib was going with a caravan to Syria, and when on the point of starting the messenger of God clung to him so tenderly that his heart melted away and he said: "By God, I shall take him with me and shall never part from him." He, accordingly, started with him, and as they were wont to do, they alighted near the cloister of a monk, called Buḥairā, who was deeply versed in the books of the Christians. He always lived in the cloister, where was deposited a book from which the monks instructed themselves, and that book was handed down from generation to generation. In previous years they had often passed by the cloister, but the monk never talked to them or took any notice of them; but this time he had had a meal prepared for them, since, as it is believed, he had seen from his tent that a cloud had shaded the messenger of God in particular among the members of the caravan, and how this cloud shaded the tree where he, with the caravan, had sat down, and how the branches of the tree had bent down for his better protection. When the meal was ready Buḥairā sent for them and invited them all, young and old, slave and freeman. One of the Quraish said: "It is surprising you have never shown any such favour before, and we have passed by this cloister so often. Why then to-day?" Buḥairā answered: "It is so. However you are now my guests and I will entertain you to a meal to which

[1] Das Leben Moh., Vol. I. pp. 86-88. Ibn Isḥāq's Life of the Prophet survives in Ibn Hishām's Hist. of the Prophet (d. 823), which is practically a revised edition of Ibn Isḥāq's work.

you shall all come." Lo! they all went to him, only the messenger of God remaining behind under the tree on account of his youth. When Buḥairā did not find among his guests him on whom he had expected certain signs, he said: "You Quraishites, none of you shall hold back." They replied: "No one who should be here has been left behind save a child, the youngest in the caravan." Upon which Buḥairā rejoined: "Call him, he shall partake of the meal with you." Then one of the Quraish said: "By Al-Lāt and 'Uzzā, it was not at all right of us to have left the son of 'Abdu-llah behind." Thereupon he went to Mohammed, embraced him and placed him by the side of the others. Buḥairā cast a keen glance at him, and looked for the distinguishing signs he believed he would find upon his body. When the meal was over and the people dispersed, Buḥairā stood up before him and implored him by Al-Lāt and 'Uzzā (for the Quraish used so to do) to answer his questions. It is believed that the messenger of God said to him: "Implore me not by Al-Lāt and 'Uzzā, for by God! nothing is more hateful to me than these idols." Then Buḥairā said: 'No! I implore thee by God, answer my questions." Mohammed then said: "Ask what thou thinkest proper." Then he asked him many personal questions, and the messenger of God gave him the required information, and it agreed with what Buḥairā already knew of him. Then he looked at his back and found between his shoulders, at the place described in the book, the seal of Prophetship. It looked like the marks of a cupping-glass. Having done this, he went to Abū Tālib and asked him how the boy was related to him. He answered: "My son." "Not

thy son," rejoined Buḥairā, " for the child cannot have his father living." " No! he is my nephew," answered Abū Ṭālib. " And what about his father?" questioned Buḥairā. ' He died while his mother was pregnant," was the reply of Abū Ṭālib. " Thou hast now spoken the truth. Go home with the child and protect him from the Jews, for by God! if they see him and recognize him as I have done, they will do him injury, for thy nephew will one day occupy a distinguished rank. Therefore hasten homeward." Abū Ṭālib did so as soon as he had finished his business.

According to Ṭabarī, the Prophet was nine years of age when the meeting with the *Rāhib* took place, but it is noteworthy that one reads in Ṭabarī of the monk putting Abū Ṭālib on guard against the Romans and not the Jews, as it appears in Ibn Isḥāq.[1]

In Mas'ūdī (900—956 A.D. the story is related thus:[2] " Buḥairā, the monk, lived also in the Fatrah; he was a believer in Christ and his name in the Christian book is Sergis (Sergius). Buḥairā was of the 'Abdu-l-Qais tribe. When Mohammed went to Syria with Abū Ṭalib, Abū Bakr and Bilāl, at the age of thirteen years, on mercantile business, they passed by Buḥairā, who was sitting in his cell, and he recognized the Prophet, comparing his appearance and the signs he bore on him with what he had found in his books, and observing the cloud which shaded him whenever he sat down. Buḥairā received them as his guests and paid them great respect and gave them refreshments. He went forth from his

[1] Tabarī, 1st series, pp. 1123-1127.
[2] Sprenger's transl., Vol. I, pp. 149-150.

cell to see the seal of Prophetship, between the shoulders of the Prophet, he placed his hand upon it and believed on him. Buḥairā informed Abū Bakr and Bilāl of his destination and he asked him to come back with him the same way. He warned *them to be watchful for him against the believers in the scriptures.* His uncle Abū Ṭālib, having received this information, returned with him. When he was come back from his journey to Mekka, he began his acquaintance with Khadijah, and the signs were wrought, which, together with the account which she received of his journey, made her believe that he was a prophet.''

In Ibnu-l-Athīr the story is substantially the same as in Ṭabarī. The entire story is false and fabricated and owes its origin to the fertile imagination of Ibn 'Abbās. It must have been set down in writing about A.H. 100, but doubtless it was in circulation half-a-century earlier. Thus we see that the earliest account is silent as to the name of the monk. The next and natural step is reached when a name has been chosen for the monk. A further colour is given to the story by the addition that the *Rāhib* discovers the seal of Prophetship and notices other distinguishing signs which indicate the approaching greatness of Mohammed. Originally the monk is purported to have warned Abū Ṭālib against the Jews. In subsequent accounts we have the warning against the Christians. Such has been the course of this remarkable legend.[1] I have dealt with it at considerable length, as it would be

[1] Buḥairā is said to have been originally a Jew. That perhaps accounts for his two names. As a Jew probably he was called Bahir, but on con-

extremely interesting to compare the Arab with the mediæval version of this legend.

To pass on to the mediæval writers.[1] From their point of view it seems that Mohammed was not merely a false prophet and a corrupter of youth, but also a common cheat and a son of destruction, leading away weak souls from truth by holding out to them worldly attractions of the most sensual nature. Reference has already been made to the Byzantines who, in their own interest, sought to cast dirt on Islam. But, however inclined they might have been to foist false and foreign principles upon Islam, they could scarcely deny certain points of resemblance between Islam and Christianity. To explain away these very points of agreement and resemblance between the two religions, they eagerly adopted the fiction that Mohammed was, by birth, a Christian. We will, therefore, turn to Theophanes in whom we get the earliest Christian account of the rise of Islam, which, being accepted and incorporated by Anastasius in his Church history, received extensive circulation. It embraces almost all the leading features of the Mohammed-fables of the Middle Ages. History, tradition and fiction are all inextricably blended together. We read there of Mohammed's poverty, his marriage with Khadījah, his commercial journeys—pure historical facts—along with unfounded statements such as this, that the Prophet studied Judaism and Christianity

version to Christianity he took the name Georgius which was converted in Arabic into Sarjis. See Weil, Moh. der Prophet, p. 29, note (15).

[1] In writing this portion of my paper, I have had Prutz's Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge constantly by my side.

from their respective books. Moreover we make our acquaintance here with the fable, later on repeated with a peculiar zest, that Mohammed invented the story of his intercourse with the angel Gabriel in order to allay the anxiety of Khadījah for the epileptic fits with which he was often seized. In Theophanes, further, a monk who had been expelled from the Church for heresy appears on the scene as the lover of Khadījah. This monk is said to have confirmed the claim and statement of Mohammed regarding his prophetic mission and thereby lent assistance to him. It is noteworthy that though from the 11th century onward books were unceasingly written upon Islam and subjects connected with it, yet they were purely controversial and vituperative. As such they were mere reckless and thoughtless reproductions of the strangest falsehoods. Never was a serious attempt made to understand Islam or to study the life of Mohammed. We might mention, in passing, that almost contemporaneously with the activity of Raymond, the Archbishop of Toledo, in the translation of Arabic works on philosophy, an attempt was being made by Peter the Venerable of Cluni to obtain translations of the Qur'ān and theological works.

Peter the Venerable, the stout champion of Catholic orthodoxy, deploring the want of materials for carrying on an energetic struggle against Islam and reproving the Christians for hitherto neglecting and failing to supply it, embarked upon a settled plan of campaign. The starting point was naturally to be the Qur'ān, and for this reason he had it translated into Latin. The history of this first translation is not without interest. Perhaps

it would be a misnomer to call it a translation at all, inasmuch as Robert did not translate it literally, but 'only gave the sense of the Arabic text as well as he could.'[1] For the life of Robert we have the sole authority of Leland, and Leland is silent as to the source from which he obtains his information. Robert, an Englishman, is said to have travelled through France, Italy, Dalmatia and Greece into Asia, where he learnt Arabic. About July 1136 he seems to have settled down in Barcelona under the patronage of Plato of Tivoli, and by 1141-1143 he apparently was living 'near the Ebro' with a friend Hermann, the Dalmatian, for the purposes of studying Arabic. Subsequently he became the Archdeacon of Pampeluna. In 1141 Peter the Venerable employed the services of Robert and Hermann for translating certain Arabic books into Latin. The result was that four translations were given out to the world, with a preface, from the pen of Peter. "Of these four works in this volume," says my friend, Mr. T. A. Archer, "which afterwards formed materials for Peter the Venerable's treatise against Mohammedanism, Robert translated a 'Chronica mendosa et ridiculosa Saracenorum,' *i.e.*, an account of Mohammed's ancestry and life, together with a history of the Caliphs down to the death of Yazid I and the murder of Husain (10th April 680 A.D.) and a translation of the Qur'ān with preface by the translator and addressed to Peter the Venerable."

We have it from Robert himself that he finished his translation of the Qur'ān between 16th July and 31st December 1143.

[1] Dict. of National Biography, p. 362, Vol. XLVIII.

The works of Peter the Venerable open an era of polemics against Islam. He is the chief source from which the mediæval Christians received their notions of Islam. Henceforward we have an unceasing current of invective against Islam in almost all the European languages. Some writers even ventilated their venom against the Prophet and his religion in verse; for instance, Walter of Sens treated the life of Mohammed in Latin, while Alexander Du Pont did so in French verse. Robert's translation of the Qur'ān was apparently widely known in the Middle Ages. Alberich of Trois-Fontaines, who flourished in the thirteenth century, seems to have been aware of it, but does not appear to have used it. Very often, indeed, we have polemical treatises against Islam cast in the shape of a report of a real or imaginary discussion between Christians and Muslim theologians. It is undoubted, however, that discussions did take place and were even frequent; for instance, a discussion is reported to have taken place in Aleppo, in 1215, in the presence of a son of Saladin between a monk called George and three Muslim theologians. Raymond Lullus also informs us of a discussion which took place in 1309 at Bugia. At this discussion a Jew, a Christian and a Muslim, one after another, explain their faith to a heathen who, after carefully weighing the evidence, decides in favour of Christianity.[1]

The most unjust charge constantly laid at the door of the Muslims by mediæval writers is that of idolatry.

[1] Prutz, p. 75.

We can hardly be called upon to seriously refute it. Still it is curious, indeed, that we should be repeatedly told that Muslims worshipped Mohammed as a God. " Belief in Mohammed and our other Gods " is put in the mouth of a Muslim by an authority on the Crusades. Some writers, indeed, call Mohammed " the God of the heathens " who is daily worshipped and glorified. In Arnold, of Lübeck, Saladin is made to say, after the battle of Hittin, to the captured prince : " Thou hast felt my exalted hand through the power of my God, Mohammed," and the following is the answer put in the mouth of one of the Christian knights : " That Mohammed, the son of ruin whom thou callest thy God we despise, deny and curse." In the report of the False Turpin, regarding the expedition of Charles the Great to Spain, Mohammed is constantly spoken of as the God of the Muslims and, according to Matthew Paris, Mohammed was worshipped by Muslims precisely as Christ was by Christians.

The Saracens are alleged to have called out : " O Mohammed and ye other Gods." By Mohammed and all other Gods they are made to swear in mediæval writings. It is reported that when Tancred, after the conquest of Jerusalem, entered the mosque which had been built at the place where formerly was a temple, he found such a heavy silver image of Mohammed that several men could not lift it. Even Fulcher of Chartres pretends to have heard of an idol, an image of Mohammed, set up at that very mosque. Jacob of Vitry, moreover, asserts that whenever Muslims were in possession of Jerusalem they set up in the quondam

Temple an image of their Prophet and forbade Christians access thereto. It was even said of Muslims that before undertaking an expedition against the Christians they consulted an idol called Mahomet, *i.e.*, Mohammed. These stories, bearing upon their face the stamp of falsehood, were largely invented and freely put in circulation. They sprang up in luxuriant abundance at the time of the Crusades. We have already alluded to the reasons for such fabrications. Guibert of Nogent[1] presents, for the first time, the scattered fragments of the Mohammed-fables of the Middle Ages in a compact and connected whole, but he is honest enough to tell us that his information is entirely based upon the popular tradition handed down from mouth to mouth. He had no idea even as to the time when the Prophet lived, but, says Guibert, he could not have lived in remote antiquity inasmuch as a doctor of the Church has written against his evil deeds.

The following, according to Guibert, are the chief events in the life of Mohammed. A hermit of somewhat doubtful faith and virtue tried unsuccessfully for the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Foiled in his attempts he meditated revenge upon the Church and accordingly he betook himself to solitude. The devil, making use of his ill-humour, counselled him to employ, for his evil design, a youth who was to shortly present himself to him. This youth was no other than Mohammed. The hermit, knowing how to win him over for this purpose, helped

[1] Guizot, collection des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France, IX, pp. 23 *et seq.*

him in his marriage with Khadījah, who, upon the representations of the hermit that Mohammed was a God-sent prophet, decided to accept a poor, low-born husband for herself. Mohammed, however, was soon seized with epileptic fits, and Khadījah, frightened and alarmed at this malady, hastened to the hermit for an explanation. She was, thereupon, assured that the apparent epilepsy was only the condition in which Mohammed was honoured with divine revelations. Mohammed gradually but steadily began to gain ground and earn the reputation of a prophet. The monk, then, suggested to him to present his doctrines in the form of a code and confirm it by a miracle. The faithful were accordingly ordered to fast for three days. Then Mohammed in a solemn assembly announced to them the impending revelation and behold! there suddenly appeared specially trained for the purpose by Mohammed—a cow with the book of revelation " between his horns " and knelt down before the Prophet. After that, says Guibert, no one entertained any doubt regarding Mohammed's prophetic mission, and the new teaching, founded on vile deceit, rapidly spread among the people. Of the contents of this book Guibert evidently knows nothing beyond that it has thrown wide open the door for the worst sensual indulgences and sanctioned the wildest excesses in that sphere. The end which he ascribes to Mohammed is quite in keeping with the rest of the legend. While walking by himself Mohammed is attacked by his malady, falls unconscious on the ground and is devoured by pigs right up to his heels, which alone remained of him.

This incident, it may be mentioned, is said by the mediæval writers to be the reason of the abstinence of the Muslims from pig's flesh. Such is the brief outline of Guibert's account of Mohammed. Let us go on now to Hildebert, the learned Bishop of Lemons, and later on the Archbishop of Tours (d. 1133), who wrote a history of Mohammed in distichs full of the choicest fables. Like the rest of his contemporaries he calls Mohammed all kinds of names, and ascribes his success to the assistance of a sorcerer. In him also we have the story that his corpse was devoured by swine.

About the first half of the XIIth century Walter of Sens wrote a similar poem under the title of *Otia Walteri de Mohometa*. He treated in it the rise of Islam upon the authority of a Muslim, who had accepted Christianity. and had wended his way to France from the Far East.

The gradual modification or rather the re-setting of the story of the monk is worthy of attention. It appears that people began to feel qualms of conscience in believing the real founder of Islam to be a disloyal priest in whose hands Mohammed was no more than an instrument. This feature, accordingly, is cast aside. In Hildebert of Lemons a magician takes the place of the monk, and in Walter of Sens the hermit is no longer mentioned as the spiritual guide of Mohammed, but as a person possessed of the rare faculty of divination, who predicts and prepares the people for the danger with which Mohammed threatened the Church.

In Walter, moreover, we notice quite a new feature. He tells us of a war between the supporters of Mohammed and the Persians. The Prophet tried his utmost to avert

it, but when he failed in his attempt he is said to have cowardly kept back. The growth and expansion of these stories proceed with an increasing volume. The marriage of the Prophet with Khadījah in conformity with the other incidents of life, has been equally adorned with the hues of legend. It has been ascribed to a cunningly-laid device of Mohammed. We are told, with unblushing effrontery, that the Prophet, in order to overcome the hesitation of Khadījah to marry her slave, got round her tribes-people by dishonourable tricks.

Not infrequently Mohammed is described in Christian writers as a born slave. We stand aghast at such perversions of truth. In Hildebert of Lemons we read that Mohammed proved his divine mission through the medium of a bull—secretly trained by him—but which no one else could manage. This bull knelt down before him at his bidding. In other writers a camel plays this part and appears with the book, containing the revelations, round its neck. In Andrea Dandolo Mohammed is said to have trained a white dove to perch upon his shoulder and pick grains from his ears. This dove was given out to be the divine messenger who brought the revelations of God to him. Moreover, we read in Andrea Dandolo of Mohammed setting himself up as the Messiah in order to obtain the sympathy and allegiance of Jews and *Saracens*. Khadījah here figures as a princess through whose marriage the Prophet attained worldly power and eminence. The right hand of the Prophet is said to be the Nestorian monk Sergius who, by the aid of Mohammed, seeks to injure the church. In the Venetian account Mohammed-fables are cleverly

woven with the most unwarranted aspersions of the supporters and sympathisers of the Crusades. According to Dandolo the death of the Prophet was caused by poison. Then he goes on to say: " that being confident that he would ascend to heaven, the Prophet enjoined his followers to leave his body unburied for three days. His order was obeyed, but the expected miracle did not take place, and therefore after twelve days of futile expectations the horribly rotting corpse had to be buried. Other writers substitute a vulture in place of the dove and, at their will, add or subtract from the fables in circulation.

In the *Gesta Imperatorum et Pontificum* of the Tuscan Thomas (written about 1278) there is preserved a large collection of these fables. We have there the priest, the dove, the cow in fine everything is worked up into a most superb legend which the author pretends to have taken from an old book which he found in the sacristy at Bologna. The continual growth of these legends will be amply seen by the story which we now meet for the first time. It is in reference to a monk, who, concealing himself in a well, exhorts the people to obedience to the new dispensation. Mohammed feeling uneasy about him proposes to do away with him, and with this object commands the people to fill the well up, thus getting rid of a dangerous friend. The completest collection of the traditions, fables and slanderous inventions of the mediæval writers about Mohammed we find in that portion of *Speculum Historiale* of the Prince of Beauvais which deals with the history of the Prophet. There Mohammed is described as a travelling merchant who, as such, gains a superficial acquaintance with Christianity

and Judaism, but at the same time he is also labelled as a sorcerer who, by his witchcraft, wins over the rich Khadījah. The author further informs us that by giving himself out as the Messiah Mohammed succeeded in making numerous adherents. Then follow the current stories; the dove which speaks to Mohammed in his ear, the trained cow with the book of revelation between his horns and the pit with milk and honey. The Prince, moreover, adds an extract from the dialogue between a Christian and a Saracen which Peter the Venerable, of Cluni, gave to Europe in a Latin translation. According to it Mohammed is nothing more than a waylayer and robber, a murderer and an outrager of every law—human and divine.

In the pages of Beauvais, however, occasional gleams of sunshine fitfully appear.[1] From authors such as Guibert, Hildebert and the Prince of Beauvais, it is a relief to turn to William of Tripoli. He stands far above his contemporaries in point of information and hence he sees in Islam something to admire and commend. It would be rash, however, to apply to his work a severe historical test, for he lived in an age when the line of demarcation between history and legend was but thinly drawn. Still when we come to his work we feel as though we are breathing a purer and a more wholesome atmosphere. His vision is not clouded by prejudice nor his judgment controlled by pre-conceived ideas. He endeavours to understand Islam and the Prophet to the

[1] Prutz, pp. 82-83.

best of his light and leading. In him Mohammed is not described as a complete impostor or a perverter of truth, nor is he overwhelmed with accusations for which there is not the slightest shadow of foundation. William is not unfamiliar, indeed, with the Buḥairā legend. He, moreover, knows the names of some of the companions of the Prophet and gives us a fairly accurate account of the early days of Islam. We shall now hear what William has to say. Put briefly, the following is the sum and substance of his account of the rise of the Prophet and his religion : " On the caravan road from Syria to Mekka, in the neighbourhood of Sinai, there lived a pious Christian hermit called Buḥairā in whose cell the merchants passing that way were wont to stop. Among these would come, so it was revealed to Buḥairā, a Saracen boy whom fate had fixed for doing injury to the Church. This set Buḥairā enquiring, with the result that he found Mohammed to be the one. Buḥairā, to stave off the fulfilment of the prophecy, decided to bring up the young Mohammed as a Christian. When the boy came to the courtyard of the hermit the low doors became as high as the gates of a king's palace ; so the Saracens assert who cause the future greatness of the boy to be shadowed forth in this event. Brought up in the Christian faith and treated by Buḥairā with the warm and devoted attachment of a son, Mohammed grew up far away from the idolatry of his tribesmen. As a youth Mohammed travelled backwards and forwards for the purposes of commerce, attending honestly and conscientiously to the work confided to him. The death of his master and his marriage with the rich widow at once brought him into

prominence. A great number of the Arabs collected round him, but ten persons—Abu Bakr above all—were bound to him by special ties of loyalty and devotion. His friends, however, saw with growing distrust his relation with Buhairā, and accordingly his companions murdered the monk, while Mohammed, exhausted by a long talk and full of wine, had fallen off to sleep. On waking up Mohammed believed that he himself was the perpetrator of the bloody deed, during the state of intoxication, and hence, forsooth! the prohibition to his followers against drinking wine. With the murder of Buḥairā, for Mohammed thought himself to be the murderer, all the evil passions were unchained in him, and he and his Arabs, thenceforward, went about the country conquering and to conquer and committing all manner of excesses. After eleven years of glory and splendour Mohammed died leaving behind him his daughter Fatima.

What William of Tripoli has to say about the Qur'ān is too intensely interesting to be omitted. In his 45th year, so he relates, Mohammed believed that he was called to his prophetic mission and to receive the divine revelation through the Archangel Gabriel. These revelations, as they came, were written down by his followers, and this was the origin of the Qur'ān. The Christian writers, however, so the preacher-monk informs us, represent the matter otherwise. They tell us that fifteen years after the death of the Prophet the surviving companions of Mohammed formed a plan of recording the teachings of their Prophet, but those to whom the task was entrusted felt themselves unequal to the occasion,

and hence they sought the aid of the Jews and Christians who had embraced Islam. They, accordingly, drew upon the Old and New Testaments, abstracted passages therefrom, and incorporated them, with more or less modification, in their work. Thus came the Qur'ān into being. William, moreover, goes through the Qur'ān dealing in the first place with passages which have a bearing or reference to Christian ideas, and in the second with those which illustrate the Muslim conception of God. He shows that Muslims not merely worship God, as the author of the universe, but also honour Christ as a Prophet and accord due respect to the Virgin Mary. As a missionary he had spent a considerable time among Muslims and by constant intercourse with them he had noticed, and was frank enough to confess, the good moral effect which Islam was capable of exerting upon its followers. The bright side of Islam is invariably brought out and emphasised by those who had lived among Muslims and looked at things in their true light and not merely strove to incite Christians against Muslims.

Theitmar, for instance, praises the Prophet for inculcating on his followers the principles of mercy, self-sacrifice, and sympathy with the poor and the suffering. Then again Otto of Freising makes a spirited vindication of Islam against the charges of idolatry and image-worship brought against it by Christian writers. He boldly asserts that Muslims are severe monotheists and honour not Christ alone but also the Apostles. To his mind the principal error of Islam lay in looking upon Christ as a mere man, in other words, in not accepting him as God and in honouring Mohammed as a Prophet.

The scholastic Oliverius of Cologne addressed a lengthy letter to Al-kāmil of Egypt in which he discussed the various points of resemblance between Islam and Christianity with the hope of inducing him to go over to the fold of the Church. He, moreover, acknowledges and praises, in most enthusiastic terms, the noble generosity of Al-kāmil towards the unhappy participators in the siege of Damietta.

Gerhard of Strasburg, who was sent by Frederick I with a message to Saladin, has also some observations upon Islam. Though they are not altogether free from unjustified fault-finding, yet his observations on the morality and customs of Muslims are, in a large measure, candid and dispassionate.

But the preacher-monk, Nicoldus of Monte Cristo, whose career falls towards the end of the XIIIth and the beginning of the XIVth century, towers far above the rest of his contemporaries both in breadth of vision and impartiality of judgment. He had spent years as a missionary among Muslims, and knew the Qur'ān to perfection. Though he took upon himself to refute the religion of the Prophet, yet he was not blind to the good results flowing from Islam, and even goes to the length of asking his co-religionists to accept Islam and the Muslim as their models in some respects. He describes with admiration the attention paid to the study of the Qur'ān in the schools at Baghdad. More than three months, he relates, he lived amidst the camel-drivers of the desert, but never, not even in times of distress and difficulty, did they forget to perform the prescribed prayers. Among many Muslims, he notes, their passion for

prayer rises to ecstasy. The washing before prayers, enjoined by Islam, Nicoldus considers worthy of imitation. The preacher-monk was delighted with the spirit of charity prevailing among Muslims. He enumerates the various charitable institutions among them ; for instance, the payment of the tithe for the use of the poor, the so-called law of the fifth, according to which one-fifth of the property acquired in battle was to go to public charity, the rich endowments for charitable purposes, the expenditure of money for ransoming Muslims taken captive by Christians, and finally even the anxiety of the Muslims for the safety of birds and animals. Then he goes on to illustrate the deep and profound respect of the Muslims for God by saying that they begin all their writings by an invocation to God, exclaiming ever and anon "Praised be His name" and their taking off their shoes before entering the mosque. He bears testimony to the generous hospitality of the Muslims and tells us that whoever once takes their salt can always rely upon them with absolute certainty. But though fair and even liberal-minded, Nicoldus is sometimes borne away with the prevailing stream. Occasionally he betrays the ignorance rather than the prejudice of his contemporaries. But even his errors of judgment do not detract from his work its value and interest, since it must be judged upon the general view which it takes of Islam. With the doctrines of Islam, as we might expect, he has no sympathy. He calls them confused, false and unintelligible.

Notwithstanding all this, however, the spirit of the writer is very different from that of the writers of his age. He tries to understand and to do justice to the

principles of Islam, and this fact stands out conspicuously in his work. Nicoldus does not pour forth invectives on Islam, nor does he indulge in diatribes against the Prophet, but endeavours to demolish, what he calls the false doctrines by the trenchant blade of logic. In doing this, indeed, he displays perfect familiarity with the Qur'ān. That the Qur'ān does not rest upon a divine revelation he shows by pointing to the historical errors in it; for instance, in the account of the Virgin Mary, who is said to have lived even before Moses and Aaron and before the coming of the Jews to Palestine. Sometimes we even discover rationalistic criticisms in Nicoldus; for instance, he declares the splitting of the moon, mentioned in the Qur'ān, to be impossible. As arguments of the unreasonableness of the Qur'ān Nicoldus urges, with force and cogency, the law relating to inheritance, the statements about the devil and the sensual pleasures awaiting the faithful in Paradise. He further indicates the charges made by the Muslims against the genuineness of the Pentateuch and the Gospels. The points of agreement between Islam and Christianity are explained away in the usual fashion, *i.e.*, the help of the Jews and Christians. Two Jews and the Jacobite called Buḥairā are said by Nicoldus to have given instruction to Mohammed in the Old and New Testaments.

Generous expressions, like those of William of Tripoli, Gerhard of Strasburg and Nicoldus of Monte Cristo, passed away only too lightly heard amidst general imprecations and invectives which, decade by decade, grew louder and louder. Not through the Middle Ages alone was the figure of Mohammed wrapped in the mists

of fables and legends, but however startling it might seem, the truth is that it is only within recent times that the light of history has commenced to disperse the mists of antiquated errors and to discover the real and historical Prophet of Arabia. Witness the "Mahometanism Unveiled" of Charles Foster which appeared as late as 1829. Thanks, however, to the industry of Caussin de Perceval, Weil, Von Kremer, Sir William Muir and Krehl we now possess an intelligent and indeed historical portrait of Mohammed and a fairly accurate exposition of the doctrines and tenets of Islam. But we still look, in vain, for an exhaustive life of Mohammed from the pen of a Muslim. We fondly hope and trust that before long this gap in Islamic literature will be filled up!

THE SELJŪKS BEFORE THE CRUSADES

Western Europe has been familiar with the name of the Turks since the invasion of the Huns, for it is indisputable that they were of the Turkish stock.[1]

They, however, came in contact with the Muslim world at the time of Mu'taṣim, the third son of the Caliph Hārūn. It was Mu'taṣim who first enlisted them in his soldiery, but they who entered as slaves were fated ere long to preside over the destiny of the Caliphate of Baghdād.

It was, indeed, with the help of the Turkish archers that the general of Mu'taṣim defeated the Byzantine army, commanded by Theophilus and Manuel, at Dasymon.[2]

The introduction of the Turkish mercenary in the army of the Caliph was, indeed, one of the many causes which brought about the fall of the 'Abbāsids. It began to play the same part which was played in Italy by Recimer, Gundobad, and Orestes. It made and unmade four Caliphs successively.[3]

So extensive, indeed, had become their authority that in 879 Aḥmad, the son of Ṭūlūn, made himself independent in Egypt, and founded a dynasty which continued for nearly half a century. Similarly the Ikhshīdids ruled as independent sovereigns in Egypt,

[1] Gibbon, ed. Milman, Vol. V, p. 172, note (a).

[2] Finlay, Vol. II, p. 157.

[3] Jonquiere, *L'Emp. Ottoman*, p. 104.

Syria, and even Mekka and Medina. The state of Baghdād was distressing; after a beautiful dawn a sultry noon had set in. During the time of decay and dissolution there were Caliphs incapable of meeting the difficulties of sovereignty and unworthy of wielding its authority. There was no Leo, or Zeno, or Anastasius to breathe fresh vigour into the decayed constitution and thereby prolong its life.

Baghdād was sinking day by day into political insignificance. In the tenth century Caliph Ar-Rāḏhī placed in the hands of his minister the administration of finance, the power of waging war and of making peace—in fine, metamorphosed him into the veritable Caliph,[1] and contented himself with the vain and empty title. This newly-created minister used and abused his power till the long pent-up resentment of the people of Baghdād found vent in a vigorous protest. The help of the Buwayhids of Persia was sought and obtained, and the Turks, who had gained immense influence in Baghdād, were driven out; but the title of the Amīr-ul-Umarā was coveted and secured for the new conqueror. For a century the fate of Baghdād remained in the hands of the Buwayhids, who in the end yielded to a stronger power, though not without a struggle.

The new actors in the world's drama were the Seljūks. In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries a great portion of Asia was ruled by Turkish dynasties.[2] The first heroes of Seljūkian Turks were

[1] Guyard, *Le Civilisation Musulmane*, pp. 25, 26.

[2] There is an excellent article on the Seljūks in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

Ṭughril Beg, Chagar Beg, and Ibrāhīm Niyāl, the sons of Mīkā'īl, the son of Seljūk. They were members of the Turkish tribe of Ghuzz, and traced their descent from Oghuz, the eponymous hero of all Turkish tribes. This band of Turks entered the fold of Islam in the fourth century after the Flight. They lived beyond the Oxus,[1] and were viewed not without serious apprehension by the neighbouring Muslim State. The policy of Maḥmūd, the Ghaznawid, was distinctly hostile to them. This course of action was extremely politic, as events in the sequel showed. He drove the Seljūks to Adharbījān; but his son and successor, Mas'ūd, deviated from the wise and cautious policy of his father, and re-inforced his army by 1,000 Turkish horsemen taken from these fugitives of Adharbījān. The policy of Maḥmūd, to keep these Seljūkian marauders at arm's length from his dominion was completely reversed, and the unwise Mas'ūd paid the penalty of his indiscretion in the battle of Merv. In this battle, fought in the year 1040, the Ghaznawids were completely defeated.

But before this successful attempt of the Seljūkians, the Turkish tribes had made many abortive efforts to extend their dominion. Under the leadership of Isra'īl or Pigu Aslān, a portion of the Seljūks crossed the Oxus and spread over the Eastern provinces of Persia. This adventurer was captured and imprisoned by Mas'ūd, but his punishment, instead of staving off, only precipitated the impending fall of the Ghaznawids. His nephews, either exasperated at the imprisonment of their uncle or swayed by motives of plunder, crossed the Oxus and

[1] Ibn Khallikān, art, on Ṭughril and Alp Arslān, Vol. III, pp. 224-34.

swooped down like a whirlwind on the plains of Persia. After a desperate battle, Persia, once the kingdom of the Sassanians, received as lords the Scythian hordes. This was the famous battle of Merv. Shortly after Merv was raised to the dignity of a capital, and Ṭughril saluted as the chief of the Seljūks.[1]

The victory of Merv inspired confidence in the princes and Ṭughril Beg, Chagar Beg, and Ibrāhim Niyāl began their career of conquest; but their success was not without occasional failures. Ibrāhīm was the most successful in his military exploits; he bore his victorious banner in the year 1048 as far as Melzikerd, Erzerūm and Trebizond. The ambitious Ṭughril watched the career of Ibrāhīm with impatient jealousy, and, in an angry passion, called upon him to surrender to him his claim over Hamadhān and Jibāl—his recent conquests. This bold request was met with a peremptory refusal. A civil war, which for a moment checked the advancing career of the Seljūks, was the result of this fraternal dispute. Ultimately Ibrāhīm was compelled to submit.

At this juncture, when the progress of the Seljūkian branch of the Turks was in full tide, Baghdād was, so to speak, at its last gasp. The Caliphs of Baghdād, we have already noticed, were incompetent *fainéants;* ruled by the Buwayhids or some other Turkish potentates. At the time of Al-Qā'im bi-Amrillāh, Basāsīri, the general of the Turkish troop of mercenaries at Baghdād, who held the chief authority there, revolted against *Al-Qā'im*, and even succeeded in expelling him from

[1] See the curious way in which the Turks used to elect their king.—Migne, *Dict. des Croisades*, p. 996.

Baghdād. The injured Caliph enjoyed liberal hospitality at the hands of Al-'Uqailī[1] Lord of Al-Hadithah and 'Anah : and after experiencing the humble fortune of an exile for an entire year, obtained the aid of Ṭughril. The Seljūkian chief entered Baghdād and seized the person of Malik-ar-Rahm, the last prince of the Buwayhids.

Basāsīri, however, just managed to escape. He sought help among the Fāṭimids, acknowledged their Caliph as the true successor of Mohammed, and successfully fanned the smouldering passions of Ibrāhīm Niyāl into a blaze.

Basāsīri, with the help of these two potentates, attained partial success, and reinstated himself in Baghdād at the close of the year 1058. The vigilant Ṭughril was ready at hand to mar his success. In the next year, Basāsīri, after attaining this "bad eminence," fell a victim to treachery, and was slain in battle; while the turbulent brother of Ṭughril was strangled.

No sooner had Ṭughril planted his foot in 'Iraq and Adharbījān than he directed his attention to the 600 miles of the frontier which extended from Taurus to Erzerūm. In 1060 he laid siege to Edessa, but his effort was foiled by Vest, the Commander of Antioch, that venerable city where the followers of Christ were first called Christians. It was this city, indeed, which for a time rendered the power of the Turks insecure in Asia Minor ; and we might fix upon the year 1068, when Antioch was betrayed by Philaretus, as the real date of the foundation of the Sultanat of Rūm.

[1] Ibn Khall, Vol. I, p. 173.

To celebrate these brilliant victories, Ṭughril re-entered Baghdad and was betrothed to the sister of the Caliph, but died in September, 1063, before the marriage[1] could take place. While the waves of Turkish invasion were sweeping over Syria and Asia Minor, the Byzantine Empire showed no sign of arresting its progress. Fiscal oppression and social disaffection had been for generations the blight of Byzantium. Ever since Justinian, who prodigally lavished the accumulated wealth of Anastasius in the long conflict with Persians, Vandals and Goths, the pinchbeck Augustus drained the wealth of the nation and filled the imperial treasury. The avarice and the sloth of Constantine not only encouraged the onsets of the Turks from without, but also encouraged the aspirations of the Norman mercenaries within the limits of the Byzantine Empire. It was in his reign that Robert Guiscard took Bari, the last stronghold of the Byzantine Empire in Italy. Every kind of abuse was current in the Empire. Rebellion and insurrections had become commonplace.

The short reign of Nicephorus III was disfigured by five rebellions, of which four proved abortive. The fifth, however, was successful, and put the crafty Alexius at the head of the Byzantine Empire. The founder of the house of Comnenes impersonated in himself the vices of his age. Capable of simulation and dissimulation, he played throughout a treacherous part in the Crusades, though, perhaps, his faults were magnified by the hatred of the Latin historians.

[1] Deguignes, *Histoire des Huns*, tom. ii, part ii, pp. 189, 196-98. See Ibn Khallikān, concerning the marriage of Ṭughril.

Indeed, an impartial historian will not accuse Alexius of having any hand in the various misfortunes suffered by the Crusaders in their march.[1] But to discuss this matter would take me beyond the limits of my subject.

Before the much-censured Alexius had ascended the throne Ṭughril had died, and the chieftainship of the Turks had devolved on the famous Alp Arslān, who might well be chosen as the hero of an epic.

The virtues of his uncle were reflected in his character, and in his short but brilliant career he strove to surpass him both in conquest and magnanimity. The first act of this new chief was to lead his army into Iberia and the northern parts of Armenia. He next attacked the capital of Armenia, Ani, which is situated on a rocky peninsula overhanging the rapid stream of Rha, the ancient Harpasus.[2] After a gallant resistance the capital of Armenia was taken on July 6, 1064. By the conquest of Ani Alp Arslān reduced Armenia and Georgia to complete subjection. The Turks now ravaged Melitene, Syria, Cilicia, and Cappodocia at their will; provinces which in the past had endured with patience the widely desolating ravages of the Sassanians, the Omayyads, and the 'Abbāsid Caliphs. The Greeks, who at first bore these Turkish ravages with singular indifference, were at last roused to resistance when they saw the inhabitants of Cæsarea massacred and the Church of Basil plundered. This was in the days of the rash and

[1] See the eloquent defence of the learned Anna, pp. 488, 491; Finlay, Vol. III, p. 152.

[2] Finlay, Vol. III, p. 18.

impetuous Diogenes, who owed the throne to his marriage with Eudocia.

For two years Alp Arslān's lieutenants continued to ravage Asia Minor. In four successive campaigns Diogenes undertook the expulsion of the Turks; but what might have been discernible to the unsealed eye of a prophet was obscure to the ordinary man. The result of all these campaigns was remarkable. At first Diogenes strove to save Antioch from the Saracens of Aleppo; but, before anything had been done in that quarter, it was noised abroad that the Turks were once more plundering Asia Minor. The news at once called Diogenes to the North, but such was the rapidity of the Turkish retreat that before his arrival they had gone back into their own territories. The expedition proving useless, Diogenes returned to Constantinople in the year 1069.

In the following year Manuel, the brother of the future Emperor Alexius, made Sebaste his head-quarters, with a view to establishing an effectual bulwark against the Turks. This Manuel, however, in an unfortunate conflict with a Turkish leader, was made prisoner, and his captor, Chrysokroul, began to nourish seditious plans against Alp Arslān. The fiery Alp Arslān, indignant at such schemes and exasperated by the encouragement given by Manuel to the rebellious vassal, once more took the offensive and besieged Menzikert, which lies between Erzerūm and Lake Wan. Diogenes marched for its relief and retook it with the greatest ease. The Turks proposed a treaty, but their overtures were spurned, and Diogenes hazarded a battle.[1] Many causes contributed to the defeat of the Byzantine Emperor. He

[1] Migne, Dict des Crusades, p. 998; Gibbon, Vol. VII, p. 60.

28

was betrayed by his own generals; and on August 26, 1071, Alp Arslān won a decisive victory. The powerful pen of Gibbon has described with dramatic effect the treatment of Romanus Diogenes by Alp Arslān. An honourable treaty was concluded, and Diogenes willingly agreed to pay an annual tribute of three thousand and sixty pieces of gold, and to liberate his Muslim captives.

On his defeat the tide of popular favour turned against the unfortunate Romanus. After various changes of fortune and the lapse of several years, the fortune of war declared for Alexius the throne of Byzantium.[1] The career of Alp Arslān, however, was shortened by the dagger of an assassin shortly after his great victory at Menzikert, but even that great conqueror's death could not prevent Asia Minor from being the prey of Turkish bandits.

Alp Arslān's successor was the famous Malik Shāh, whose name owes an additional glory to the noble qualities and administrative vigour of his chief minister, Nizam-ul-Mulk. In the year 1072, he succeeded Alp Arslān, after successfully encountering opposition from his uncle Kawurd. He accomplished the conquest of Turkistān, an idea which long floated before the mind of Alp Arslān. Syria and Palestine bowed before his victorious arm; and Bukhārā, Samarqand, and Khurāsān submitted without a blow. Under Malik Shāh, the Seljūkian Empire reached the meridian of its glory. He gave away Syria to his brother *Tutush*, who established himself at Damascus, and killed Atsiz,[2] and

[1] Defeat of Romanus, 1071; Alexius Emperor, 1081.
[2] Ibn Khall, art. on Tutush, Vol. I, p. 273.

he entrusted Sulaymān with a subordinate sovereignty in Asia Minor. It was this Sulaymān who became the founder of the Sultanat of Rūm. Circumstances were favourable to the Turks, since persecution and fiscal oppression, the peculiar features of the Byzantine Empire, had made the Christian population irretrievably hostile to the Greeks and to Greek rule.[1]

In addition to the hatred felt by many of its subjects for the Byzantine Empire, other circumstances tended to strengthen the Seljūkian power in Asia Minor. In the year 1074, Michael VII actually recognized the rule of Sulaymān in order to obtain the support of the Turkish mercenary in suppressing the rebellion of John Dukas.

Nicephorus III gave additional weight to the treaty concluded with Michael by recognizing and confirming it. This policy was adopted by Nicephorus to secure the help of the Turks in dethroning Michael VII. A similar process was repeated when Nicephorus Milissenos rebelled against Nicephorus III. This rebel went even further and yielded up the possession of Nicea to Sulaymān, who made it his capital. Even Alexius, anxious to avoid any hostility with Sulaymān, holding under him as he did the greater part of Asia Minor, wisely marked the Drako as the boundary between their kingdoms. It was to this ambitious chief that Antioch was betrayed by Philaretus in 1084, when the Sultanat of Rūm was fixed on a permanent basis. By taking Antioch, Sulaymān was involved in war with the Amir of Aleppo and with Tutush by whom he was completely defeated in the neighbourhood of Aleppo, and it is said that, to avoid

[1] Finlay, Vol. III, p. 88.

falling into the hands of his enemies, he committed suicide (1086).

These discords, serious as they were, urgently called for the interference of Malik Shāh, who, keeping the sons of Sulaymān in captivity, entrusted the affairs of Asia Minor to his generals, Bursuk and Buzan. Then followed more peaceful and less stirring times and, after a prosperous and successful reign of twenty years, vanished from the scene Malik Shāh, leaving the throne and the sceptre to Bargiyāruk. This monarch, on his accession in 1092, allowed Kilig Arslān, the son of Sulaymān, to return to the dominion of his father.

It was this Kilig Arslān who in 1096 defeated and killed the reckless band of Crusaders under Walter the Pennyless.[1]

After the death of Malik Shāh, the kingdom of the Seljūk was dismembered, suffering the same fate as that of Charles the Great, after the death of that great monarch. One of the reasons which Guizot assigns for the decline of the Empire of Charlemagne applies with equal truth to the Empire of Malik Shāh. He thinks that in an age when mankind comparatively is still in its infancy, it is impossible to wield the machinery of government with any degree of efficiency over large and extensive areas, and indeed for obvious reasons.

Want of culture among the people and the poverty of political intelligence in the Government coupled with the physical barriers which nature has interposed between one country and another are calculated to make

[1] On this point the recital of Albert is ample and amusing. *Coll. des Mémoires*, par Guizot, Tom. XX, pp. 22-32.

the task of ruling vast Empires, like those of Charles the Great or Malik Shāh the Seljūk, difficult nay impossible. The difficulties of communication between one country and another, or even between one town and another, tend to weaken and paralyse the powers of the Central Government by making the administration of distant provinces merely nominal and not real, and by enabling the ambitious governors to rule practically as independent sovereigns. This fact very glaringly stands out in the history of the Caliphate. Immediately after the death of Malik Shāh, the symptoms of weakness began to manifest themselves—symptoms against which no political wisdom could contend with effect. Distinct and independent principalities were formed within the bosom of the Empire reared by Malik Shāh, destroying thereby the unity of the Seljūkian Empire. We are not, however, concerned here with the history of the reigns of the sons of Malik Shāh.

Tutush, who had been invested by Malik Shāh with rule over Syria, died fighting against Bargiyaruk, near Rayy, in 1095.

Just before the arrival of the Crusaders the spirit of faction and defiant independence had become general among the Muslims, and it was a wise and shrewd remark of Ibn-ul-Athī, that it was this spirit of disunion amongst the Muslim chiefs that favoured the arms of the Christians.[1] If the Muslims had had a ruler like Alp Arslān or Malik Shāh when the Crusaders burst upon Syria, the latter would never have attained the success which they actually did in the first Crusade. The ill-

[1] *Bibliothèque des Croisades*, Tom. IP, pp. 1-4.

organised army, the unwieldy councils of war, the recurrent conflicts between the chiefs, the long train of women and children, of old and infirm, would have told heavily against the Franks had the Crusaders had to face a chief like Malik Shāh.

But in the internecine warfare and angry feuds, constantly flooding the Muslim States with waves of blood and checking the progress of the Muslim arms, are to be sought the causes of the numerous defeats which the Crusaders inflicted upon them. At the time of the first Crusade Asia Minor, as we have already mentioned, was in the hands of Kilig Arslān, the son of Sulaymān, and the North of Syria under the Prince Kemischtechin. This Prince belonged to the Dynasty of Danishmend. Its founder was a certain Tailu, who, as runs the legend, was a schoolmaster, from whom his descendants took the title of Danishmend.

The early history of this dynasty is shrouded in mystery; but it is probable that after the death of Sulaymān the members of this dynasty took Sīwās, Tokhat, Nicsar, Ablastan, and Malatīya. At the time of the first Crusade, Kemischtechin was the ruler, and it was he who took Bohemond prisoner.[1] In Mesopotamia there were similar disorders. Kerboga, who was appointed the Governor of Moṣil, declared himself independent. In Syria the confusion was immense. Of the two sons of Tutush the elder, Ridwān, established himself at Aleppo,

[1] Ordric has coupled a beautiful legend with the release of Bohemond—Guizot, *Mémoires*, Tom. XXVIII, pp. 122-140. But Ibn-ul-Athīr is perhaps more trustworthy on this point. He says that in the year 1102 Bohemond recovered his liberty by means of 100,000 pieces of gold—Reinaud, *Bibliothèque*, Tom. IV, p. 17.

the younger, Dukāk, took possession of Damascus. The arms of these two brothers were turned against each other, and so blind was their hatred that, when Bagi Sian, the Commander of Antioch, asked the help of the Muslim Amirs against the Franks, Ridwān refused his aid, because his brother Dukāk had joined Bagi Sian.

There were other principalities : Geinaudaulah held under him Emesa ; Bagi Sian, Antioch ; and Fakhr-ul-Mulk Ibn 'Ammār, Tripoli.

A fact which further illustrates the unhappy divisions prevailing amongst the Muslims may be cited here. Although Tughtigīn of Damascus and 'Ammār of Tripoli, repeatedly applied to the Sultan of Persia for help, it was only after several fruitless appeals that he at last consented to assist the Muslims of Syria.

A well-disciplined Turkish troop was sent under a certain Givali Scava ; but, instead of concentrating the different forces of the Muslim Amirs and directing them against the Franks, the Sultan preferred to attack Gekermish, who had followed Kerboga in the principality of Moṣil. At a time when Christian Europe was aiming at the destruction of the Muslims, this was a singular error of policy. Gekermish, indeed, was slain ; but the Franks received no check from the Sultan of Persia.

Since the Muslims were divided among themselves, and were seeking each other's fall, we need not wonder at the brilliant success of the first Crusade.

THE OMAYYADS AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE

At first sight, it may appear strange, that while the Eternal City yielded to the barbarous assaults of the Goths, Huns, and Vandals, Constantinople was spared similar humiliations.

But our surprise will pass away the moment we closely examine the conditions of the two cities. The survival of the new Rome was owing to many causes. The foremost, perhaps, was its peculiarly advantageous position, which could defy, as it actually did defy, its assailants, and laugh them to scorn. History has preserved the record of the joint effort of the Persians and Avars in the year 626, and of the annual sieges of Constantinople by the Arabs from 672 to 677. In all these cases, and in others besides, the situation of Constantinople was the condition of its safety.

Next to the fortifications which Nature provided for her, she depended for her security upon a series of rulers who were of different metal from the successors of Honorius. Leo and Zeno, Anastasius and Justinian, were equally instrumental in saving the throne of Arcadius from such disgrace as befell that of Honorius.

Again, it is a remarkable fact that the barbarians, already impressed by the grandeur of the city of Constantine, and mindful of their former misfortunes in assailing it, invariably showed, after a time, a tendency to move westward. The barbarians did indeed harry the Eastern Empire, but their ravages were local or temporary; they failed to make any durable impression.

When Alaric turned towards Italy, it was because he remembered the evil days of the past, and desired to

woo the capricious goddess of fortune in the West rather than in the East. Whatever evil he inflicted on the Balkan Peninsula was repaired during the forty years which intervened between his departure and the ravages of the terrible Huns, who completely desolated Thrace and Illyricum. Like the storm of the Visigoths, this was also chased away. The Ostrogoths, the Slavs, and the Bulgarians tried their steel of prowess on the Empire, and it was not till the time of Anastasius that any measure was adopted effectually to roll back these barbarous tides.

This Emperor built the famous walls to check their predatory incursions. Justinian followed the same course of policy, and built many fortresses to bar the progress of the Slavs and Avars.

Had the Eastern Empire only had to contend against the barbarians, it would have preserved the allegiance of its distant provinces, and perhaps have averted the danger from Arabia which threatened and at last overwhelmed it. But it had also to struggle against the internal dissensions which day by day were exhausting it, and preparing it for its doom.

Two facts stand out in clear light, and explain the easy success of the Arabs in the seventh century.

Theological disputes in the first place, and fiscal oppression in the second, thrust a wedge of antagonism between the people and the bureaucracy of Constantinople.

The triumph of the metaphysical subtleties innate in the creed-spinning East is visible enough in the heresies (such as Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Monophysitism, and Monothelitism) which worked mischief with-

out end, and succeeded eventually in making the people perfectly in different to the welfare of the Empire.

Besides religious persecutions—the characteristic feature of the Eastern Empire—fiscal oppression weighed heavily on the people, and reduced them to a condition of mild slavery. Thus there was no bond to link the interest of the subject to the Empire, no patriotism to inspire the warrior fighting for his native land, and no conception of the higher principles of religion to mitigate ferocity and allay passion. In vain did Tiberius and Maurice devote themselves to elevate Roman society, to give it a firmer basis, and invigorate it with nobler principles. When the Eastern Empire was thus tottering to its fall, the wind of fortune wafted from the shores of Africa a man who could meet the difficulties of the time by enforcing drastic measures of reform. This was the famous Heraklius—a strange production of the seventh century. He might well have rivalled the fame of Alexander, or Hannibal, or Cæsar, had not the latter part of his life been clouded and overcast by the defeats inflicted on him by the Arabs.

The appearance of Heraklius at a time when the Roman Empire was in the throes of affliction, and the contemporaneous appearance of Mohammed at Mecca as a prophet, legislator, and warrior of the Arabs, are the most singular and interesting events which the seventh century witnessed.

At a time when Arabia was undergoing rapid social and political changes, Mohammed appeared. By means of commerce, fresh ideas were diffused among the nomadic inhabitants of the desert; and by constant connection with the Greeks they gradually assimilated their

manners and their civilization. The commerce of the Red Sea was practically in their hands, and, in fact, the important depôt of Jotaba was in their possession from the time of Leo I to that of Anastasius. Circumstances favour men of genius, and the appearance of Mohammed was only consistent with the needs of the time. A member of the family of Quarish, he was intimately acquainted with the secrets of commerce. While the nation was heaving with fresh, healthy, and manly ideas, the air was saturated with canting morals and corrupt tastes. Persia was under the demoralized teachings of Mazdak, and the Byzantine Empire was wanting in sound customs and moral discipline. Thus from all points of view the rise of Islam occurred at a very favourable time.

We shall pass over its earlier days, and commence our survey after the Treaty of Ḥudaībiyah. No sooner had Mohammed established his religion on a firm footing than he began to aspire to carry it beyond the confines of his native country. Ever since the Treaty of Ḥudaībiyah, Mohammed had continued to send envoys to the foreign chiefs, soliciting them to embrace his religion. The first conflict with the Greeks was caused by the murder of one of these envoys in the Balqā'. The Muslim army, however, was completely defeated at Mu'tah in 629, and Khālid only just succeeded in bringing back the remnant of his troops.[1]

[1] Sale, Prelim. Disc., pp. 19, 28, 29.

For the facts I am largely indebted to the scholarship of Finlay and Professor Bury (Finlay, Vol. I, pp. 351-398; Vol. II, pp. 1-40; Professor Bury, Vol. II, pp. 258, 386). Also I have drawn upon the following works: Sismondi "Chute de l'Emp. Rom." Tom. I, pp. 403-423; Tom. II, pp. 1-102; Drapeyron, pp. 298-352, 361-382, 394-405; Gibbon, Chapters LI-LIII; Gasquet, pp. 48-92.

In the following year it was noised abroad that Heraklius was contemplating an attack on the followers of Mohammed. The Neophytes girded their loins; an army was organized, and the spiritual head of Islam was lost in the leader of a fearless army. With 30,000 men Mohammed advanced to meet Heraklius, but before he got any further than Tabūk[1] the report proved to be false. The expedition, however, was not fruitless. Several Jewish and Christian communities in the north of the peninsula were reduced to subjection. Thus it is evident that Mohammed in his life-time abundantly proved his intention of giving to Islam a universal importance. Even just before his death the Arabian prophet prepared an expedition against the Greeks, and it was just ready to start when he died (June 8, 632).[2]

The death of the Prophet foreboded a dangerous and a doutful career for Islam. The pent-up antipathy of the rude idolaters again offered resistance to its progress, and had there not been the courage of Khālid and the wisdom of Abū Bakr, the opponents of Islam might have gained the day. The immediate successors of Mohammed were bold and resolute, and undoubtedly it was they who paved the way for the greatness of the Muslims.

If the conflict between ʻ Alī and Muʻāwiyah had never occurred, and had the better days of Islam continued without a cloud, the future of the Muslims would have been happier, and perhaps more successful. It was, however, destined that an irrevocable schism should ere long be established. This event proved an inestimable bless-

[1] See Gibbon, Vol. VI, Smith's note (*a*), p. 259.

[2] Bemont et Menod, *Histoire de l'Europe*, pp. 140-171; Duruy, *Histoire du Moyen Age*, pp. 91-112. The dates are inaccurate.

ing to the Eastern Empire, as it left Constans II free to deal with the Slavonians.

The Caliphate of Abū Bakr was short but brilliant. The rebels who denied the religion of the Prophet, and relapsed into their former idolatry, were forced to submit; and the Muslim banner showed itself on Persian and on Christian soil.

In 633 Syria was invaded by the Arabs, and, although Heraklius was at Edessa or Antioch, he watched this new danger which threatened to dismember the Empire with complete indifference. About the end of 633 Bostra was besieged, and early in the following year surrendered. It was an age of uninterrupted success for the Muslims; city after city was won, and the failure of the Romans to stem the tide was complete. Just before the death of Abū Bakr the Battle of Ajnādīn[1] was fought, and a Roman army defeated. In the history of the military achievements of Islam, the stern Omar has inserted a brilliant page. Legend may have honoured him by coupling with his name romantic exploits, mere creations of fancy; but history does him no less honour by classing him among the best of rulers and most successful of national leaders.

Towards the end of 634 Khālid won a great victory on the banks of the Yarmūk (Hieromax). Theodore, the brother of the Emperor, and the commander of the imperial troops, was defeated. At the Battle of Yarmūk the knell of Syria was struck. One victory was the herald of another. Damascus was laid siege to, and taken after a gallant defence by the citizens. Emesa,

[1] Guy le Strange, *Palestine under the Muslims*, p. 389. July 30, 634, the battle was fought, and death of Abū Bakr, August 22.

Hierapolis, Chalcis, Berœa, soon fell into the hands of the Neophytes. Heraklius, seeing these misfortunes darkening his old age, quitted Syria in 636. His departure was followed by still more terrible misfortunes. Antioch and Jerusalem fell in 637.

A gleam of hope once more brightened the hour of despair, and in 638 the Byzantine Cæsar made one last effort to regain Northern Syria. He sent his son Constantine to Syria, and at Amida concentrated an army, which boldly attempted to wrest Northern Syria from the Muslims; but in the contest the Romans were defeated, and Syria continued to owe allegiance to its new master.

Though the mass of the Syrians calmly accepted the Muslim yoke, some still maintained their national spirit and national vigour. From Mount Taurus a band of stalwart warriors passed on to the recesses of Mount Lebanon, where they lived in the freedom to which they were wedded. These were called Mardaites. So long as they quartered themselves in Mount Lebanon, they were a source of serious danger to the Muslim power in Syria. They not only kept back the torrent of Muslim invasion, but often took the offensive, and made incursions into the Muslim countries.

One of the reasons which induced Mu'āwiyah to conclude peace with Constantine IV was the constant harryings of these Mardaites. Although they were rendering real service to the Empire, they were looked upon with suspicion, and even with hatred, by the Court of Constantinople. At the time of Justinian II, however, they were removed from Mount Lebanon, and distributed among the provinces of the Empire. The removal of this hostile population told favourably on the progress of the

Muslim arms, and 'Abdu-l-Malik availed himself fully of the opportunity.

If Syria had to mourn its widowhood, Persia was no less unfortunate. In the Caliphate of Abū Bakr, while Abū 'Ubaidah was sent to wage war with Syria, Khālid was commanded to bring Persia under the Muslim domination. Khālid was in the enjoyment of a prosperous career on the upper bank of the Euphrates, when he was recalled, and ordered to join the more pressing Syrian invasion.

But the honour of reducing Persia to subjection was reserved for Sa'd. In 636, Sa'd, the lieutenant of Omar, won the Battle of Qādisiyyah. A few months after this battle he stormed and pillaged Madā'in, the capital of the Persian Empire. Early in 637 the battle of Jalūlā' laid at the feet of the Arabs "all the land west of Mount Zagrus, from Nineveh to Susa." For the completion of the conquest of Persia the battle of Nehavand was all-important (642); but Persia was not completely subdued till 651, when Yazdigird was assassinated at Merv, and his son fled to the Emperor of China.

Egypt, which had seen strange revolutions, was also to feel the Muslim arm. Though easily conquered, it was continually exposed to attacks from the Byzantine Empire. The various causes of discord already referred to favoured the progress of the Muslims, and the fate of Egypt was the best illustration of it. The Jacobites viewed the Greeks with implacable animosity, and the feeling found a responsive chord in Greek hearts. Already Djarih, the Governor of Egypt, had answered the message of Mahomet with sufficient enthusiasm and courtesy, and when 'Amr proceeded to its conquest, he

was not received as an enemy, but hailed as a deliverer. The Patriarch Cyrus, in concert with Mokaukas, fondly hoped to stave off the horror of war by paying an annual tribute to the Saracens; but Heraklius rejected the proposal, and sent Manuel to defend the province and break off the negotiation. In the battle Manuel was defeated, and 'Amr was left to carry his hostile sword throughout the country.

The siege of Pelusium cost 'Amr thirty days, but he had to spend seven months of labour before Babylon (the Roman fortress close to the site of modern Cairo) capitulated.

Alexandria next attracted the victor. The citizens withstood the siege for more than a year, but, as no help was forthcoming from Constantinople, they yielded to the persistency of the Muslims. The loss of Alexandria was greatly mourned by the Empire. Two efforts were made to recover it, but on both occasions the Arabs defeated the Romans.[1]

From Alexandria the Arabs advanced towards Libya, and took Barca, Tripoli, and Sabra. But there suddenly came a halt in their progress, on account of the civil war which desolated the Muslim Empire in the second half of the seventh century.

When the stern hand of Omar was removed from the helm of the State (644), social and political anarchy slowly began to steal over the Muslim Empire. The Caliph 'Uthmān was weak as a ruler and fickle as a

[1] The Muslims, after conquering Alexandria, left a feeble garrison there, and the Romans, seeing the opportunity, tried to recover Alexandria, but were defeated. In 646 Constans II sent an army under Manuel to retake Alexandria, but this attempt also proved abortive.

man. The errors issuing from want of firmness were expiated by his murder (655), which was indeed an ominous signal for internecine warfare.

Two rival claimants disputed the Caliphate. We cannot detail here the varying success of ʻAlī; suffice it to say that he was ensnared by the treachery of Muʻāwiyah. By tactics at last the Governor of Syria attained the goal of his ambition, and became sole Caliph, notwithstanding the opposition which raged in Mesopotamia and Persia. The murder of ʻAlī (660), indeed, greatly helped Muʻāwiyah in consolidating the power he had so fondly coveted but so dishonourably won. ʻAlī left two sons, Ḥasan and Ḥusain. The people of ʻIrāq clung to the family of ʻAlī, and proclaimed Ḥasan Caliph; but the noble son of Alī, resigned his claim in favour of Muʻāwiyah. Whatever might be the faults of Muʻāwiyah, there is no doubt that posterity has been unduly severe on the son of Abū Sufyān.

True it is that he sacrificed religious principles to selfish interest; true it is that contemporaries saw his hand in the deaths of Ashtar and Ḥasan; and true it is that his dealing with ʻAlī was unworthy of a companion of the Prophet. But the sober judgment of a historian will be favourably influenced in estimating his character, when he reckons the services he rendered to Islam.

It has too often been asserted that, with the rise of Muʻāwiyah, the democratic principles of Islam vanished.[1] Vague as the expression is, perhaps it is also inconsistent with facts. It, indeed, cannot be denied that the Arabs loved freedom,[2] but it is extremely doubtful if they ever

[1] Ameer Ali: Spirit of Islam, p. 441.

[2] See the remarks of Ibn Khaldun on the characteristics of the Arabs Prolég.

harboured the truly democratic ideas which permeate the Cantons of Switzerland.

In the early days of Islam the Caliph was both the political and the spiritual leader of the Muslims. His word was law; disobedience to his commands was a violation not only of the country's but of God's Law. Had the first three Caliphs been ambitious, cunning, and artful, absolute monarchy would undoubtedly have been then erected under the shadow of theocracy.

To any keen observer of the political current of the time it must have been obvious that the age of absolutism and tyranny was at hand; and it was a mere chance circumstance, indeed, that Mu'āwiyah should have displaced that half-religious and half-political presidentship which culminated in Omar, and was corrupted in 'Uthmān. The political ideas of the Muslims have found a loud echo in the pages of *Fakhri*,[1] and it is noticeable that he, like the rest, propounded, favoured, and emphasized the theory of an absolute and an irresponsible monarchy.

In fact, it was an age in which no other form of government could have continued with any success. To cope with the exigencies of the time, to struggle with the intricacies of political diplomacy, and to make the jarring interests of the discontented parties chime in with the will of the leader, no man then was more suited and more adapted than Mu'āwiyah. It was not idle flattery nor vain praise when Omar bestowed on the son of Abū Sufyān the title of the Cæsar of the Arabs. The political attitude of Mu'āwiyah towards the immediate successors of Heraklius was indeed worthy of a consummate states-

[1] "Ad-Duwalu-l-Islāmiyyah," Publ. Gotha. *Vide* Introduction.

man. He stands in emphatic contrast to Hārūnu-r-Rashīd. As soon as history dispels the glamour of romance which has gathered round the name of the hero of the "Arabian Nights," Hārūn is shown as a different man. He then appears as a whimsical, sensual, and impulsive monarch. His relation with the Eastern Empire was that of a robber. When he made Tyana the base of operations for Asia Minor, and gazed at the seat of Augustus from the hills above Scutari, he ravaged the fairest provinces with the delight which is characteristic of a barbarian. No sooner had he effected a razzia than he departed. To bring those provinces with the pale of Islam was not his aim ; he was a mere robber, who cared for nothing beyond carrying off rich plunder.

Far different was the case with the son of Abū Sufyān. Though he failed in taking Constantinople, yet he invested the capital with the definite intention of planting the crescent in the place of the cross. Religious toleration was deeply-rooted in him, and during his Caliphate the Christians enjoyed equal privileges with the Muslims.[1] A strong personality like Mu'āwiyah was necessary, and doubly necessary, to pacify the commotions of the time.

[1] It is extremely unjust to accuse the early Muslims of intolerance. We must remember the words of Finlay, that " liberty of conscience was an idea almost unknown to any but the Mohammedans " (Finlay, Vol. I, p. 375). Persecution is indeed contrary to the principles of Islam, and the Qur'ān itself says, " Let there be no violence in religion." Perhaps Muslim history will not furnish a parallel to the cruelty with which Charlemagne treated the Saxons, and Henry the Fowler the Slavs. A discursive review only of the laws of Charlemagne, framed for Saxony, will show how little indeed the then most Christian King of Europe appreciated the teachings of Jesus (Zeller, Foundation de l'Emp. German, pp. 29, 30). If we refer to the persecutions by the Muslims in Spain, we shall on almost all occasions find that the

'Alī was a most chivalrous knight, and, indeed, impersonated in himself the noble qualities of the Quraish and the beautiful virtues of the Arabs, but he was much below the mark of a statesman. If he had any genius, it was more fitted to be displayed in a religious assembly than in a political cabinet. An ardent visionary, a weak commander, and a religious idealist, he would have imperilled rather than bettered the condition of the Muslims. There is only one event in the life of Mu'āwiyah which a historian cannot fully explain; it is the succession of Yazīd. How a wise father, conversant with the follies of the son, could have elected him as his successor is one of the anomalies which history has often presented. We need not be reminded that the philosophic Emperor Marcus Aurelius fell into an error which he would have condemned in others. He, like Mu'āwiyah, adorned his

Christians compelled them to take that course. Mr. Hines, in his brilliant monograph entitled "Christianity and Islam in Spain," has brought home this fact very clearly. His treatment of Islam is most liberal and most Christian in spirit. The feelings of the Mohammedans on the subject is expressed in the beautiful saying of 'Abbās II, one of the Persian *sūfis*, "that it is for God, not for me, to judge men's conscience, and I will never interfere with what belongs to the tribunal and Lord of the universe." Again, Akbar followed in practice the principles thus expressed by his minister, Abu-l-Fadhl: "Persecution, after all, defeats its own end: it obliges men to conceal their opinion, but produces no change ,, (Hines, p. 92). The Code of Justinian incapacitated Pegans, Jews and Samaritans from holding civil or military office, except in the lowest ranks of the latter. Further, we find that the assemblies of all heretics were forbidden, their books were to be collected and burned, their rites, baptism and ordination prohibited (Milman, "Latin Christianity," Vol. II, p. 34). The Mohammedans never grudged giving offices to non-Mohammedans; in fact, we find Abdul Malik holding Akhtal, the Christian poet, in great honour. When they conquered a country, they always respected the established cult of the inhabitants (Reinaud, "Invasions des Sarracens en France," p 8). Very often the Christians were so fiercely persecuted in the Eastern Empire that they took refuge among the Mohammedans.

profligate son with the purple, despite the fact that he trampled upon the virtues of manhood, and shed a lurid light on the purity of his father.

With the accession of Mu'āwiyah, Damascus rose to the dignity of a capital. We shall now pass on to refer to the relation of this dynasty with the Eastern Empire till the accession of Leo the Isaurian, in whose reign was fought the last great battle with the Omayyads at Acroinon.

From February 11, 641, to September, 642, the policy of Constantinople was blighted by Court intrigue. With the accession of Constans II, the house of Heraklius resumed its former vigour, and though there were losses of frontier and of small islands, this reign may be justly classed among the halcyon days of Constantinople.

In 638 Mu'āwiyah was appointed the Governor of the Muslim Empire, from Egypt to the Euphrates. During his political career he acquitted himself well. It was under him that the Muslims first built a naval armament, and inflicted a memorable defeat on the Roman fleet at Phœnix, off the Lycian coast.

The year 646, in which Manuel made a fruitless attempt to recover Alexandria, also witnessed the defeat of the Roman army sent against Mu'āwiyah, who paid back the insult by overrunning parts of Asia Minor and Armenia.

The preparation of a fleet was highly beneficial to the cause of Islam. Cyprus (649) had first to feel the power of the Muslim navy. The expedition, however, obtained only a partial success. Constantia, the capital city, was taken, and the island was visited with all the misfortunes which accompany war. Aradus (lying

between Gabala and Tripoli) next fell a prey; but the city was not destroyed till the following year. Constans, owing to the necessities of internal reform and the besetting danger of invasion from all sides, made peace with Mu'āwiyah (651).

It was an age in which the gods of the Romans had deserted them. Armenia was in 652 acquired by the Muslims by the treachery of Pasaganthes (a Persian), and when an effort was made in 654, by the Roman general Maurianus to retake the city, his hope was frustrated, and the Saracen General Abib kept the city tributary to the Caliph.

In the same year Rhodes was added to the list of the Muslim conquests, and so confident of his power and resources had the son of Abū Sufyān become that in 655 he actually prepared an armament against the new Rome, and defeated the fleet commanded by Constans II himself at Phœnix, off the Lycian coast.

With the murder of 'Uthmān (656), however, Mu'āwiyah was compelled to take the defensive. The question of his murder may be despatched here with laconic brevity. In 659, Mu'āwiyah was forced to make a treaty with the Romans in order to have all his forces at his disposal to fight with 'Alī.

The conditions of the treaty were favourable to the Romans, but the Muslim politician did not hesitate to contract a seasonable peace. The Caliph promised to pay 1,000 nomismata and a horse and a slave for every day in the year as long as the peace lasted. (*Cf.* Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, Vol. II, pp. 312-14.)

The departure of Constans from Constantinople exposed Asia Minor to further incursions, and from 663 to

667 Muslims annually invaded Roumania. But it was not till 668 that a heavy loss was sustained by the Empire. In that year Sapor, the commander of the troops on the Armenian frontier, revolted, and communicated to Mu'āwiyah the design of submitting Roumania to him, if the Caliph would support him against the Emperor. Mu'āwiyah fell in with the proposal, and sent his general Phadalas to lend him assistance.

The rebellious Sapor was not destined to enjoy the fruit of his treachery. Thrown from a horse, he died of the shock. Phadalas, intent on carrying out the plan, asked the Caliph for reinforcements. Yazīd was sent to succour him. Both generals advanced towards Chalcedon. Many cities of note were taken, among which was Amorium, but the Arabs could not long maintain possession of it. Andreas, in the last decade of the same century, retook Amorium, and put every Arab to the edge of the sword.

When Constans II had taken up his position in Sicily, he tried to assail from there the Arabs of Africa. Carthage and other cities were recovered; but the Arabs were equal to the occasion, and at Tripoli the Roman standard was again humbled.

In 668 Constans was assassinated at the baths called Daphne. The murder of his brother and the treatment of Pope Martin I will always cast the foulest shadow on his memory; yet he is deserving of some praise and some respect as an Emperor who, in the interest of civilization and progress, checked the tide of the Arabian hordes.[1]

[1] He treated Martin badly because he opposed his "type," which appeared in 648, when he was only 18. This, like the "Ecthesis" of Heraclius,

Constantine IV proved a worthy son, and steered the Empire wisely amidst the storms of politics. In his reign Crete was taken, but this conquest was short-lived.[1] The most important event of his reign was the annual siege of Constantinople by the Muslims from 672 to 677, which, had it been successful, might have considerably changed the political geography of Europe. Defeat greatly weakened the Muslim power, and, in addition, led the Mardaites to make hostile expeditions into the Muslim countries. Mu'āwiyah, placed in straitened circumstances, made a second peace with the Eastern Empire. To purchase thirty years' peace the Saracens consented to pay 3,000 pounds of gold, fifty captives, and fifty thoroughbred horses annually.

On the death of Constantine IV, Justinian II, at the premature age of sixteen, ascended the throne. Mu'āwiyah had already died (680) in the life-time of Constantine Pogonatus. The Muslim Empire after Mu'āwiyah was writhing under the lash of civil strife, and it was not till the time of 'Abdu-l-Malik that Constantinople once more suffered from the Muslim attacks.

The memory of Yazīd I is sullied by three acts—the pillage of Medina, the murder of Ḥusain and the taking of the Ka'bah—acts which have never been pardoned by the Muslims. During his Caliphate, moreover, 'Abdullah Ibnu-z-Zubair, was constantly fomenting sedition.

demanded complete silence on religious questions concerning the operation of will in Christ.

[1] Mu'āwiyah had sent an army against Crete during the time of his contemplated attack on Constantinople in 651. 'Abdullah Ibn Qais was the leader of the second expedition. After this all the Muslim attacks on Crete were from Africa.

Mu'āwiyah II reigned only forty days; his successor, Marwān, was advanced in years when he ascended the throne. He was threatened and attacked by Dhaḥḥāk ibn Qais and Muṣ'ab, a brother of Abdullah, but both these rebellions were quelled,[1] and Islam, perhaps, will be grateful to Marwān for giving it a ruler like 'Abdu-l-Malik.

'Abdu-l-Malik found himself at the helm of State at a most critical period. Though the authority of 'Abdullah Ibnu-z-Zubair was seriously impaired, he still maintained a dangerous hold on Arabia and 'Irāq. The son of Marwān had still to achieve much before he could enthrone himself without a rival. Had the Caliph to deal only with the party of Zubair, perhaps he would have attained success sooner than he actually did. In 'Irāq, however, for a time the power of Zubair was shaken by the rise of Mukhtār, who declared himself the supporter of the family of 'Alī, and wished to proclaim a son of 'Alī, Mohammed Ibnu-l-Ḥanafiyyah, Caliph. Mukhtār at first successfully waged war with the Zubairite Governor of Kūfah, till he was overtaken, defeated, and slain by Muṣ'ab and Muhallab. This event laid 'Irāq once more at the feet of 'Abdullah Ibnu-z-Zubair. We thus find a curious period in the history

[1] The cause of the rebellion of Dhaḥḥāk was strange. He was led to oppose the Omayyads on the ground that Mu'āwiyah I and Yazīd had chosen their wives from the Yamanite tribe of Kalb. It is to be remembered that this party was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the overthrow of the Omayyad dynasty. During the Caliphate of Hisham Qaisites raised the standard of revolt in 'Irāq and Khurāsān.

of Islam—four rival claimants were disputing among themselves for the sceptre and the Caliphate.[1]

Hitherto the Omayyad Caliph had suffered only reverses of fortune. Threatened with disasters within and without, 'Abdu-l-Malik was unable to give shape to any definite policy. In Mesopotamia the Omayyad troops had already been beaten, and when, in A.H. 69 (688-689 A.D.), 'Abdu-l-Malik had left Damascus for 'Irāq, he was suddenly obliged to abandon the project by the treachery of 'Amr ibn Sa'īd, who in his absence had declared himself Caliph. Owing to these besetting difficulties, the wary warrior 'Abdu-l-Malik thought it better to continue friendly relations with the Eastern Empire; and it was in pursuance of this steady policy that, in 685, he renewed the treaty on the payment of one pound of gold, one slave, and one horse for every day in the year. This policy, indeed, was sound and judicious, as any hostility on the part of the Eastern Empire, coupled with the serious disorders at home, might have been fatal to the Omayyads. In the reign of Justinian II, 'Abdu-l-Malik[2] revised the treaty which he had made with his father, slightly altering its conditions. He engaged to pay 1,000 nomismata and the daily tribute of one horse and one slave, while the Romans had to allow the Saracens half of the revenues of Armenia, Iberia, and Cyprus. But the most favour-

[1] 'Abdullah Ibnu-z-Zubair, the Caliph of Mecca; 'Abdu-l-Malik, the Caliph of Damascus; Mohammed Ibnu-l-Ḥanafiyyah, and the Khārijite leader, Najdina ibn 'Amir.

[2] 'Abdu-l-Malik renewed with Justinian the peace which he had made with Constantine. Bury, Vol. II, p. 320.

able result of this treaty for the Muslims was the removal of the Mardaites,[1] who were a real danger to the Muslim power in Syria. This false step on the part of Justinian was of incalculable importance to the Muslims. 'Abdu-l-Malik was moved to this course of policy because he had still the son of Zubair to contend against, and to him he turned his attention as soon as the friendly relation with the Eastern Empire was established. In 'Irāq the extortion practised by the Zubairite Governor insensibly increased in that reign the influence of 'Abdul-l-Malik. Before marching against 'Irāq, 'Abdu-l-Malik had already gained to his side the chiefs of Muṣ'ab's army. 'Abdu-l-Malik advanced to meet the army of Muṣ'ab's, which was encamped three parasangs from the plain of Dair-u-l-Jāthalīq. When it came to actual fighting, Muṣ'ab found himself deserted by his party; but his courage did not fail. After this victory, 'Irāq welcomed with acclamation the Caliph of Damascus. Only Arabia now adhered to the party of Zubair; but there also opposition was crushed ere long. The young general Ḥājjaj Ibn Yūsuf subdued the Ka'bah, and won it for 'Abdu-l-Malik. 'Abdullah, the son of Zubair, went in despair to his mother Asma, who counselled him to preserve his martial courage and meet death sword in hand. On October 14, 692, 'Abdullah was at last slain, and with him the last ember of Zubairite resistance was permanently extinguished.

As soon as 'Abdullah had succumbed to the Omayyad sword, 'Abdu-l-Malik became sole Caliph. True, the son of the Ḥanafiyyah was still alive, yet he was not of

[1] Ranke, "Weltgeschichte," Vol. V, pp. 188 *et seq.*

much political importance since the death of Mukhtār. The son of Marwān was, indeed, one of the most favoured children of fortune ; no conspiracy succeeded against him. The Khārijites were kept at bay during his regin ; and the insidious Ibnu-l-Ash'ath, who usurped the title of Caliph in Sijistān, was finally conquered by Yazīd, son of the famous Muhallab.

Having pacified the troubles which threatened the safety of Islam and stopped the progress of the Muslim arms, 'Abdu-l-Malik was left to pursue his conquering career. The treaty which was renewed by 'Abdu-l-Malik was not kept by the Romans with scrupulous fidelity. Leonatus, the general of the Anatolian troops, had, in defiance of the treaty, wrung Albania and Roumania from the Mohammedans. This, indeed, caused hostility between the two powers, but 'Abdu-l-Malik was too much engrossed with internal dissensions to return the insult.

On the short-sighted Justinian II the success over the Bulgarians during the year 689 or 690 brought a terrible misfortune. Being over-trustful of the Slavonic captives, whom he transformed into a " supernumerary corps," he took the offensive, and refused to receive the Saracen money, which was inscribed with some verses from the Qur'ān.[1]

'Abdu-l-Malik in vain protested against this hostile measure, and settlement was, at last, left to the arbitra-

[1] Before the time of 'Abdu-l-Malik according to Maqrīzī, the Arabs caused coins to be minted on which they preserved the Roman or Persian figures, but added Arabian names or inscriptions. In A.H. 18 Omar had coins of this kind minted. According to Maqrīzī, even 'Abdu-l-Malik had coins struck representing himself with a sword by his side. This was objected to by the Muslims. Then the Caliph substituted for them, after the year 76

ment of the sword. In Cilicia, near Sebastopolis, a memorable battle was fought. The Slavs proved treacherous, and the Saracens too strong. The victory inclined towards the Saracens, and the angry Justinian fled to the Propontis.

The immediate result of this victory was the subjugation of Southern Armenia, which was betrayed by Symbatius,[1] and Cyprus, which had already seen the Muslims on its soil, was entirely abandoned to them.

The Eastern Empire at this time was a prey to bold adventurers. Before the return of Justinian, Leonatus and Tiberius filled the throne. The reign of the former is known for the final loss of Carthage and Africa, but that of the latter might equal the military exploits of the Antonines.

Quairawān was planted by 'Uqbah in 670,[2] taken by the Christians in 676, recovered by the Arabs under Zubair, retaken by the Christians in 683, but finally conquered by Ḥasan in 697. Ḥasan ibn Nu'mān conquered the coast of Africa as far as Carthage, but no sooner was he away from the scene of operations than John the Patrician reconquered it. This conquest of John, however, was only temporary, and Mūsā ibn Nuṣair permanently drove the Greeks from Carthage and

of the Hegira, the Mohammedan coins with which we are acquainted.—De Sacy's paper in the *Journal Asiatique* (*apud* Gibbon, Vol. VI, p. 378).

[1] Professor Bury has drawn up a valuable sketch of the relation of the Arabs with Armenia, Vol. II, p. 322, note (4).

[2] Finlay, note (2), p. 382; the article on "Mohammedanism" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." Okba bin Nafi permanently established Qairawān in a little plain situated at a little distance from the first encampment of Mu'āwiyah ibn Ḥudayy, p. 566; *cf.* "Ibn Khall.", p. 35, note (5), Vol. I.

the African coast. The valiant Mūsā carried his success as far as Tlemecen. The defeat of the Romans at Carthage cost Leonatus his throne. He was supplanted by Tiberius. Again the tides turn, and to our great surprise we find the Romans making incursions in Northern Syria; and Heraklius, Tiberius's brother, gaining two successive victories over the Saracens (702 and 703 A.D.). Still, the Muslims were not altogether losers. The Roman incursion of the year 700 was answered by the capture of Mopsuestia and by the acquisition of the Fourth Armenia, which tried to throw off the Mohammedan yoke. The year in which Justinian returned from his exile witnessed the death of 'Abdu-l-Malik.[1] For six years Justinian indulged in brutal massacres, and followed up a policy of revenge.

The loss sustained by the Empire was not of any serious nature. Tyana, however, was gained by the Saracens during this period, and in 710 and 711 the Empire was attacked and invaded. After Justinian had atoned for his follies with death, three obscure and incapable Cæsars occupied the throne, till a new dynasty was founded by Leo the Isaurian. The Eastern Empire at this juncture was in a most defenceless condition. Swarms of barbarians were constantly streaming down the frontier. Thrace lay open to the plundering expeditions of the Bulgarians. Thessalonica was repeatedly besieged by the Slavonians, and the fate of Asia Minor, by the conquest of Tyana, was left entirely at the mercy of the Muslims.

The immediate successors of 'Abdu-l-Malik were Walīd and Sulaymān—two able and powerful Caliphs.

[1] He died on October 8, A.D. 705.

Under Walīd the Muslim power was extended far and wide, and the most brilliant, perhaps, of all enterprises of his age was the conquest of Spain.[1] Amasia in Pontus fell into the hands of the Muslims in 712, and Antioch in Pisidia endured the same fate in 713. It was during the Caliphate of Walīd that the Muslims prepared for a fresh siege of Constantinople. Anastasius II took every precaution to stave off the impending danger, but neither was the Roman Emperor then destined to obtain a triumph over the Muslims, nor were the Muslims to succeed against Constantinople. The death of Walīd did not prevent the execution of the plan, and perhaps the dissolution and anarchy of which Constantinople was the scene further acted as a bait to Sulaymān (715-717). Sulaymān made a bold effort. Two armies were sent in Roumania, one under the command of his brother Maslamah, and the other under a general who bore the same name as the Caliph. Amorium was besieged by Sulaymān, but it was rescued by the tact and diplomacy of Leo. While the Mohammedan army was in progress, the Isaurian general proclaimed himself Emperor (717), and won the gratitude of the people by saving them from an imminent conquest. Maslamah, in the meantime, pressed onward, and met with no serious opposition in his march through Asia Minor. After capturing Pergamus, he marched to Abydos, where, on September 1, he was joined by Sulaymān, who had come with 1,800 great warships.

The besiegers encamped before Constantinople on August, 1, 717, and after a useless siege of exactly twelve

[1] Ibn Khaldūn: "Histoire des Berbers," Tom. I, p. 341.

months retired with irreparable loss. Leo had prepared here a most powerful defence, and the winter unfortunately proved exceptionally severe. Natural difficulties, coupled with Greek fire, wrecked the hopes of the Muslims.

The siege of 718 was more vigorous than the one which Constantinople suffered in the reign of Constantine Pogonatus, and Leo, indeed, in turning back this torrent of Mohammedan invasion, faithfully discharged the responsibilities which were imposed upon him as the guardian of the Eastern Empire.

This aspiring attempt of the Muslims was followed by a transient lull, and the Caliphates of Omar II and Yazīd II were too much occupied in dealing with the new danger which threatened the Mohammedan world to make any conquest or any attack on the Eastern Empire. In the Caliphate of Omar II the reactionary movement against the Omayyads began and finally triumphed, and ruined the dynasty founded by the son of Abū Sufyān.

The Caliph Hishām, despite conspiracies against him throughout the realm, took the offensive once more, and availed himself of the anarchy which the edict against image-worship had provoked and intensified. Hishām ascended the throne in 724, but took no steps against the Eastern Empire till 726, after which the Empire was exposed to annual invasion under the generals Sulaymān and Mu'āwiyah.

The year 739 witnessed the last important engagement between the Omayyads and the Eastern Empire. A large expedition was organized, and four

generals were appointed to assail the Empire simultaneously at different points. While the Western part of Taurus was attacked by Sulaymān, and the district of Cappadocia by another general; Mālik and Sidal Battal aimed at ravaging the westerly part of the Anatolic theme. To meet this body Leo advanced with his son and successor Constantine, and inflicted upon it a memorable defeat at Acroinon, to the south of Dorylæum.

With this battle terminate the hostilities of the Omayyads against the Cæsars of Constantinople, for three successive Caliphs—Walīd II, Yazīd III, and Marwān II—were too much troubled with the 'Abbāsid movement to strike any blow at Christendom. Not again till the rise of the 'Abbāsids were the Muslims and Christians locked in deadly strife.

During the Omayyad dynasty the Muslims won laurel after laurel on the battlefield, and had they enjoyed an age of political tranquillity they might have surpassed the intellectual activity of the 'Abbāsids. Islam, if for nothing else, indeed, is indebted to this dynasty for carrying its standard to distant regions of the globe, where myriads of people welcomed, and lived and throve under, its influence.[1]

Further, it is to be remembered that it was on the foundations laid by this dynasty that the 'Abbāsids built the enduring monument of their glory—a glory which

[1] This paper appeared in the July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* (1901). Since then two very important works have appeared on this subject: Wellhausen's Das Arabische Reich und Sein Sturz and Dr. Butler's Arab Conquest of Egypt. The latter work has thrown a flood of light upon the Muslim conquest of Egypt and has largely modified the views held about it hitherto.

was not confined to political supremacy, but also brought in its train the intellectual and social regeneration of the Muslims.

A CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY ON ISLAM

While France and Germany pour forth volume after volume of sound scholarship on Oriental and particularly Islamic subjects, England shows but listless indifference towards such studies. It is all the more astonishing when we take into account the intimate relation which subsists between her and Muslim countries. The contributions of England towards Oriental learning during the latter end of the eighteenth century and the earlier portions of the nineteenth were by no means mean and inconsiderable. But of late we have been noticing among English writers a marked tendency towards holding up to the world the tyrannical acts of isolated Caliphs and thereby showing that Islam breeds vices of the worst type and fosters nothing but hatred and bitterness towards non-Muslims.

Now to pass on to the book under review, Mr. Sell has published under the title of "Essays on Islam"[1] a series of papers dealing with Islamic subjects. At the very outset we must say that his papers do not take us an inch beyond the familiar and trodden grounds. Nor can we say that his book is free from those defects which so completely mar and disfigure the works of a prejudiced writer. He has approached the subject less with the idea of discovering truths than of establishing the accusations so frequently and constantly levelled at Islam. His burthen is to substantiate the charges of Muslim intolerance and of the inadaptability of Islam to advancing

[1] *Essays on Islam* by Rev. E. E. Sell, S. P. C. K. Press, Madras.

civilization. As for his facts we believe that he is wholly indebted to Von Kremer, whose *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islam* is evidently the basis of his work. But, with great reluctance, we are compelled to confess that Mr. Sell possesses neither the profound scholarship, nor the broadness of vision, nor the large-hearted sympathy of the German savant.

Mr. Sell on page two says: "The third century found the Zindīq and Mu'tazilah controversies at their height." We are absolutely unable to understand what the learned author means by the " Zindīq " controversy. The word *Zindīq* is thus explained in *Kitābu-l-Mughrib* : "Zindīq is a well-known epithet generally applied to those who deny a future life, the immortality of the soul and the unity of God. Tha'lab says that the word Zindīq, like the word *firsin*, is not Arabic and that its meaning is a heretic, an impious man. In the work entitled *Mafātīḥu-l-'ulūm*, it is said that the Zanādiqah are the same as the followers of Mānī (Manichæans) and that the Mazdakīs were also called Zanādiqah." The use of the word " Zindīq " is clearly obscure, if the author means by it that the third century witnessed controversies relating to the immortality of the soul and the unity of God. As far as our studies go, we are not aware of any controversy which is known as the *Zindīq controversy*.

His paper on the Bābs and the Bābis is but a summary of the admirable work of Mr. Browne, the celebrated Persian Scholar, and we need not discuss it here. We can without hesitation recommend it to the reader as a handy and well-summarised paper.

On page 187, Mr. Sell quotes a series of enactments of different Caliphs against non-Muslims by which he evidently intends to point out the intolerable burden and disabilities under which non-Muslims laboured under Islamic rule. Let us pause here to consider what really was the position of the non-Muslims under Muslim masters. We had better start from the time of the Prophet: Witness the treaty which Mohammed concluded with the Christian Prince of *Ailah*. It runs thus :—" In the name of God, the gracious and merciful, a compact of peace from God and Mohammed, etc., etc., granted unto Yūḥannā (John), son of Rubah and with the people of Ailah. For them who remain at home and for those who travel by sea and by land there is the guarantee of God and of Mohammed the Apostle of God and for all that are with them, whether of Syria or of Yaman or of the sea coast. Whoso contraveneth this treaty, his wealth shall not save him; it shall be the fair prize of him that taketh it. Now it shall not be lawful to hinder the men of the Ailah from any springs which they may have been in the habit of frequenting, nor from any journey they desire to make whether by sea or by land " (See Gibbon, Bury's Ed., Vol. V, p. 539). There is not a word which we can find fault with here. To proceed further. Did the early Caliphs impose disabilities or draw invidious distinctions between Muslims and non-Muslims? History answers this question with an emphatic negative. Be it remembered that Omar, whose assassin being a non-Muslim, was yet so profoundly solicitous of the welfare of the subject-races that, before taking his final rest, he gave among others the following advice to his successor: " Lastly, said Omar, I recommend to him (his successor)

for the sake of God and his Prophet that he should keep the treaties concluded with 'the unfaithful' and wage not war with those already reduced to subjection nor lay burdens upon them (non-Muslims) which are beyond their power." (Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, Vol. I, pp. 16-17.)

Again, it will be idle to shut our eyes to the fact that for years non-Muslims had had the financial and revenue departments under their control. They alone held offices in these two departments, and that, forsooth, at the time when the fire of Muslim zeal was shining clear and bright. Two most important functions under the Caliphs were those of the Wazīr and the Kātib, and non-Muslims under more than one Caliph enjoyed these high dignities. 'Abdu-l-Malik's Kātib, Ibn-Surjūn, was a Christian; 'Abū Isháq-aṣ-Ṣabī held the same post under the 'Abbāsids and the Wazīr of 'Aḍhudu-d-Dawlah Nasr ibn Harwān, was likewise a Christian. It may be interesting to those who carp and cavil at Islam to know that Omar Ibn 'Abdu-l-'Aziz wrote to Abū Bakr Ibn Mohammed: "Examine the public books, and if any injustice has been done before my time to a Muslim or a non-Muslim ally, give back what belongs to him." (Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I, p. 589, note 4.) At this point we cannot refrain from quoting an incident connected with St. John's Church at Damascus. The account is taken from Bīlādhurī's Futūḥu-Buldân (p. 125) and is an eloquent commentary upon Muslim tolerance. We are quite prepared to concede that Muslims were never advanced enough to pass an act like the "Land Acquisition Act" and put its provisions into force, whenever policy or prudence dictated that course. How-

ever, be that as it may, Bīlādhurī's account runs thus: —"When Mu'āwiyah was appointed Governor, he wanted to incorporate the remaining portion of the Church of St. John into the Mosque at Damascus. It is to be remembered, however, that half of the Church of St. John had already been converted into a mosque under Omar. The Christians would not allow him. So he desisted from his purpose. Then 'Abdu-l-Malik, during his Caliphate, desired to do the same and offered the Christians large properties for it, but they declined to give it up. Then Walīd Ibn 'Abdul-l-Malik gathered the Christians during his Caliphate, and offered them large properties to induce them to give up the remaining portion of the Church. They likewise refused. Then he said: "If you don't give it up, I shall have it forthwith demolished." Then some of them said:—"O Amīru-l-Mu'minīn, whoever demolishes a Church, becomes either mad or is stricken with some bodily infirmity." This he took to heart. Then he sent for a hatchet and commenced to demolish one of the walls with his own hand, and at that time he was dressed in yellow silk. Then he gathered workmen, and they demolished it and extended the Mosque. When Omar Ibn 'Abdu-l-'Aziz became Caliph, the Christians complained to him as to what Walīd had done with their Church. Then he wrote to his Governor to give back what had been taken for the Mosque from the Christians. The people of Damascus were annoyed with this order and said: "Shall we demolish the Mosque after we have called out Adhāns from there and prayed in it, and allow it to be converted into a Church again?" "They went to the Christians and offered to restore to them all the Churches at *Al-ghūtah*

which had been taken by force and were then in the possession of Muslims, on condition that they should desist from claiming back the portion of the Church of St. John which had been incorporated into the Mosque under Caliph Walīd. They consented.''

The large sympathy of the 'Abbāsids is too well-known to require an amplification here. Under Manṣūr the Christians of Jundaisābūr obtained a permanent footing at the Court of the Caliph, and the Christian savants, in general, were treated with the utmost respect and consideration. In Müller's *Islam im Morgen-und Abendland* the reader will find a detailed account of the Christians of Jundaisābūr. Want of space forbids me from going into any detail here. The names of Hārūn and Ma'mūn shine forth with sufficient brilliance in the literary firmament to demand notice here. Suffice it to say that men like Gabriel, Salamūyah, Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq, Yūḥanna ibn Māsawaih, Isḥāq aṣ-Ṣābī—all Christians indeed—adorned the Courts of the 'Abbasid Caliphs.

Caliph Mu'taḍhid Billáh, who never allowed any person, whoever he might be, to take a seat in his *Durbar*, relaxed this rule only in favour of his Wazīr and Thābit ibn Qurrah, a non-Muslim: again Mutawakkil was really the first Caliph who made Christians and Jews dress differently to Muslims. But we must not forget that this was the man who desecrated the tomb of Ḥusain and set at naught the most cherished principles of Islam. Can he be cited as a model and a pattern of Muslim virtue? His diabolical acts have earned for him a reputation which can hardly be deemed an enviable one. In connection with this subject, it is well worth remembering that far from despising the customs and costume of

their subjects, Muslims accepted the conquered as their intellectual masters and learnt from them what they could teach. Nor did they scruple to assume and adopt their dress and even ways and manners. Witness Ma'mūn and Mu'taṣim Billāh. (Mas'ūdī, p. 300, Vol. VIII, Paris Edition.) Saladin, in whom were combined the qualities of a saint and a warrior, was invariably surrounded by a number of Christians. His liberality towards his opponent, Richard of England, and his uniform kindness towards the Europeans who came into contact with him, served indeed to make him the idol and hero of the mediæval world. Even the most Christian poet, Dante of Florence, assigns him a place in Heaven while he relegates Constantine into Hell. Let it be noted that the Christian bards sang praises of him, and a mediæval historian speaks of Saladin as one who never broke his word, and that, indeed, in an age when Christians violated, with levity, the most solemn treaties concluded with Muslims.

"Be faithful in the keeping of your contracts, for God will require an account of such at your hands." (Qur'ān, XVII 36.) This maxim was cited by Al-Ḥakam ibn 'Abdur-r-Raḥmān in reply to the demands of his cavaliers for a declaration of war upon the Christians of Galicia. Compare with it the declaration of the Council of Constance concerning the safe conduct granted by Sigismund to Hus: "Cum dictus Johannes Hus fidem orthodoxen pertinaciter impugnans, se ab omini conductuet privilego reddiderit alienum, nec nec aliqua sibi fides aut promissio de jure naturali dimino vel humano, fuerit in præjudicium catholicæ fidei observanda." (See Walker's Law of Nations, p. 78.)

We hope to discuss this subject at length on another occasion. A few words more and we have done. We expected that Mr. Sell would give us a chapter on the influence of Christian theology on Muslim thought. But we look for it in vain. It is a subject which might well be discussed, and if it is ably handled, it will undoubtedly throw a flood of light on many obscure questions of Muslim philosophy and theology.

Mr. Sell's paper on the Qur'ān deserves the attention of the reader.

We shall conclude by observing that in dealing with any subject it is as well that we should lay aside all our natural prepossessions and prejudices and look at it from a perfectly just and dispassionate point of view. Unless that is done, history will sink into a mere commonplace controversial literature. Fustel de Coulanges has truly said " that it is not I that speak, it is the documents that speak." The personality of the writer must remain in the background, if he hopes his work to be impartial and instructive.

THE WIZĀRAT AND GOVERNORSHIP UNDER THE CALIPHATE

THE history of the Wizārat and Governorship under the Caliphate is at once singular and instructive, and in the history of these two institutions we observe the varied and changing aspects which the political landscape wore from time to time.

The power of these two officers rose or fell as the Caliph was strong or weak. If we were to ascend the stream of time and recall to us the age of Abū Bakr and Omar, we would find the entire machinery of the new-born empire in the hands of these two men—Cæsar and Pope in one—whose word had more force than law and whose commands carried greater weight than those of the Persian Satraps or the Byzantine Cæsars; at whose feet indeed victorious generals, proud aristocrats, successful governors, powerful magnates, sat, received and obeyed commands.

But as time rolled on changes for the worse began to manifest themselves both in the public and private life of the nation. Step by step Muslims lost purity of morals, strength of character, simpleness of purpose, scorn of ill-acquired fame or fortune, and, above all, the unity and cohesion which, in a marvellously short period, secured for them an Empire greater in extent than those of Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne or Napoleon. The Caliphs grew weak, vacillating and voluptuous. Instead of fulfilling the duties of the government they

lost themselves in the silken meshes of the harem, away from the profane gaze of the world; with the result that Wazīrs usurped the powers of the Caliph, and governors of distant provinces defied or insulted his dignity or vanity. The house of Omayyah rapidly lost its strength and vitality after Omar II. Yazīd II was an incorrigible drunkard, and Walīd II an insatiable voluptuary. Hishān and Marwān, the only two gifted statesmen of the later days of the Omayyads, somewhat prolonged the days of the Caliphate, but its final *débacle* could not be averted. The House of 'Abbās enjoyed no better fortune. After Ma'mūn the splendour of the 'Abbāsids began to grow dim and faint. The Caliphs were either zealots of religion or votaries of sensuality, and it was only when the shadows of death had already commenced to hover over the 'Abbāsid dynasty that there rose Muktafī, who showed signs of life and vigour and vitality, and ruled in the proper sense of the word. But the glory of the 'Abbāsids was of short duration. The Mogul invasion, which wrecked and ruined Muslim civilisation, was already perilously near at hand. After the Mogul invasion and the sack of Baghdād (1258) there set in for the Muslim world a period of fading light and increasing obscurity, which has not completely disappeared yet.

Now to pass on to the subject under discussion. Until quite recently it was held that the word Wazīr was an Arabic word, but the latest philological investigations prove, beyond a doubt, that it is an ancient Iranian word, which has its equivalent in Pehlevi and Armenian. It might be supposed that the institution of the Wazīrat, based upon the necessity of having a colleague, a co-worker, is purely of Arab origin, but history

shows that it was an exotic flower, having its origin in Persia, and only planted among Muslims when Persian influence began to be perceived and felt. The Wazīrat was one of the well-established institutions of Persia.[1]

In the *Kitāb Ādābu-l-Wuzarā'* there is a passage of considerable import. It is said there that the Persian Kings held their Wazīrs in such honour as no other Kings had done, and said, "the Wazīr is the manager of our affairs, the ornament of our kingdom, he is the tongue with which we speak and the weapon with which we keep ourselves in readiness for attacking our enemies in distant lands." This passage clearly evidences the fact that the office of the Wazīr was firmly established in Persia, and further sets forth the extent of its power and jurisdiction. The most exhaustive information, however, on the subject will be found in *Jawharī*. The passage runs thus: "The office of Ridf involved the following prerogatives (Ibn Qutaibah, p. 320): When the king sat he was permitted to sit in the king's presence; if the king went to war, he represented the king and discharged his duties until his return; if the army returned, he received the fourth of the booty." In the "Acts of the Martyrs" by the Holy Arethas the holder of this dignity is very aptly described as *sugkathedros tou basileos*. In the kingdom of Ḥīrah, on the Persian border, this dignity was made hereditary in the family of *Yarbū*, in consequence of a treaty by which it renounced all claims

[1] In writing this article I have had Enger's excellent paper in the 13th Vol. of Z. D. M. G., entitled *Ueber Das Vazirat*, constantly by my side. Abū Salamah was the first who received the title of Wazīr and was addressed publicly as such. He was the Wazīr of As-Saffāḥ, Ibn Khall., Vol. I, p. 467. Ṣāḥib Ibn 'Abbād, Text, p. 110. (Tr., Vol. I, p. 213.)

to the throne of Ḥīrah. We obtain a further proof of the Persian origin of this dignity in the fact of its being hereditary. According to Procopius hereditary offices were the peculiar characteristic of the offices held under the Persian Government. Moreover, the closeness and dependence of Ḥīrah upon Persia furnishes an additional proof and support to the theory of the Persian origin of this office, since Ḥīrah could not have escaped foreign influence. Under the sway of Islam the holder of this responsible office was no longer called *Ridf* but Wazīr. The word Wazīr (in the sense of one who bears the burden of office) must have received currency in Arabia, at all events, before the birth of Islam, since we find the word occurring in that particular significance in Sūrah 20, 30—35 of the Qur'ān. "And give me a Counsellor (Wazīr, one who bears the burden of office) (see Ibn Khall., Vol. I, p. 468) from among my family, Hārūn my brother. By him gird up my loins and make him a colleague in my work."[1] This passage, as well as the impossibility of one man's discharging all the functions of the government, induced the Muslim jurists to advocate the appointment of Wazīr, and even to go the length of saying that the appointment of a Wazīr or Wazīrs is not only permissible but actually recommended by the law of God, so that the duties of the Governor might be performed better and error avoided.

The first four Caliphs, being capable men, dispensed with outside help, and during their administration we have no trace of this office. It faintly emerges into light under the last Omayyads and reaches its full stature and development under the 'Abbāsids. It might

[1] Rowdell's *Koran*, pp. 85, 86 : *cf.* Al-Fakhrī, p. 361.

be added here that the importance of the office of Wazīr remained unimpared until the time of Caliph Ar-Rāḍī, when the Wāzir was supplanted by the *Amīru-l-Umarā'*. Under this title it was that the Buwayhids ruled ' Irāq and Baghdād.' The Buwayhids, in their turn, were ousted by the Seljūks, who gave greater latitude and wider range of power to the Caliphs.

Under the Seljūk regency, if we may use the term, the Caliphs were once more restored to power and chose and dismissed Wazīrs according to their likes and dislikes.[1]

Upon the duties, instructions and admonitions to Wazīrs a vast literature has sprung up. The two most important works which call for special notice here are the *Maxims of Wizārat* by Māwardī and *Kitāb Adābu-l-Wuzarā'*, which is by far the more important of the two, since it contains a concise survey of all that is worth knowing in any branch of Mohamedan culture.

I may mention here the *Âthāru-l-Wuzarā'*, a beautiful MS. in the Public Oriental Library at Bankipore. It gives the history of Wazīrs from the remotest times, Persia included, and comes down to the reign of *Timour*. It is written by Saifu-d-Dīn Ḥājī Nizamu-l-Fazlī. Three other books may be mentioned here: al Fakhri's *Tārīkhu-d-Duwali-l-Islāmiyyah*[2] where the reader will find a preliminary discourse, extending over eighty pages, on the rights[3] and duties of sovereign and subjects, the

1 Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, Vol. I, p. 185; *Herrschenden Ideen*, p. 418.

2 Publ. Gotha, 1860.

3 Ibn Khaldūn, Proleg. French translation, p. 82 (note 2). Ibn Khallikān mentions Ibnu-l-Abbas 'Aṣ-Ṣūlī as the author of the "Book of

Siraju-l-Mulūk of Tartūshī, which is a sort of manual for the use of sovereigns, and the *Siyāsat Nāma* of Nizamu-l-Mulk, which is one of the most entertaining books in Persian literature.[1] The Mohamedan jurists distinguish two kinds of Wazīrat: one which is complete and unlimited in its powers, and the other which is defined and limited. The Wazīr with absolute powers is called *Wazīru-t-Tafwīḍh*. The one with limited and defined powers is called *Wazīru-t-Taufīdh*. These two officers differed from each other in rank, in power and in the personal qualifications required of them. Let us now discuss the powers of the absolute Wazīr, or as he was latterly called, the Grand Wazīr. The absolute Wazīr was the *major-domo* and *alter ego* of the Caliph. This Wazīr wielded in *fact* all the power vested in the sovereign. He differed from the sovereign only in name. Not infrequently he completely overshadowed the Caliph. It was incumbent on him, however, to keep the Caliph informed of the orders he passed and meaures he adopted, so as to maintain the semblance and show of dependence upon him. As a matter of fact he could just as well as the Caliph, directly or through a person appointed by him, carry on the administration of justice, military affairs, and other administrative works. In fine, his power fell short of that of the Caliph by three things: (1) the Wazīr could not appoint his representative or successor (this reminds us of the maxim of Roman law *delegatus non potest deligare*); (2) he could not look to

Wazirs," p. 23, Vol. I; *cf.* Brockelmann, *Arabische Littèratur*, p. 143. See Z. D. M. G., Vol. XIII, pp. 591, 637, Jihshiari, he is the author of a history of the Wazīrs. Ibn Khall., Vol. II, p. 137 (note 8).

[1] Von Hammer, Vol. VI, pp. 121 sq.

the people for his dismissal, for he was the personal officer of the Caliph; (3) he could not without special leave depose or transfer an officer appointed by the Caliph. In all other matters he had an absolutely free hand. In some things, indeed, even the Caliph could not interfere with his discretion. Such were his legal decisions and the assignment of money made by him. The Caliph, as the *de facto* and *de jure* sovereign, had, in *theory*, the undisputed power of deposing or transferring any officer appointed by the Wazīr, modifying and even of annulling any measures relating to war or administrative matters advocated or adopted by the Wazīr, on the principle that the Caliph and not the Wazīr was responsible for the affairs of the government.

In case of a difference of opinion between the Caliph and the Wazīr regarding one and the same matter, priority decided, if neither had knowledge of the other's decisions. Should this knowledge be possessed by the Caliph, his decision was final, while that of the Wazīr counted for nothing. Thus we see that the Caliph and the Wazīr had practically concurrent and co-ordinate jurisdiction. It was, therefore, of the utmost practical importance that the supreme magistrate should be possessed of high personal qualifications so as to be equal to the occasion and capable of discharging his duties with credit to himself and advantage to others.

When the Caliphate became hereditary and power passed to incompetent or abandoned voluptuaries, it was really the Wazīr who carried on the entire machinery of the state. What rendered, however, the position of the Wazīr alike delicate and difficult, was that it was

expected of him that he should be a consummate statesman as well as a finished courtier. He must be an expert in the art of amusing and humouring his master and possess what the Arabs called *Adab*, or as we would say, finished culture. An Arab writer says, "The Wazīr must know how to play the flute, chess and the Persian game of tennis. Moreover, he must be well versed in mathematics, medicine and astrology; then poetry, grammar and history, and finally he must be a good writer of poems and narrator of tales." This passage recalls to us the ideal, all-round mediæval scholar, who knew something of all arts and sciences then known to the civilised world. We are not quite certain whether we can take that passage literally, but what, in our opinion, it signifies is that the Wazīr should have received an education which has developed and trained his whole nature, made him a useful member of society and rendered him capable of bearing his part with credit in public and private life. There is a short and concise saying of Ma'mūn, on the choice of a Wazīr, which might appropriately be cited here. "I seek for my work a man possessing every virtue. A man who is pure in heart, straight in his dealings, learned in science, and sharpened by experience, keeping the secrets entrusted to him, carrying out the commands given to him; whose cleverness teaches him to keep quiet and to speak wisdom; for whom a mere hint suffices; who possesses the energy of a general, the seriousness of a judge, the humility of an 'Ālim, the keenness of a lawyer; who is thankful for his prosperity and steadfast in misfortune; who does not give up the eternal for the fleeting; who enchains the hearts

of men by the magic of his speech and the beauty of his diction." Well might we inquire if it be possible to find a man of such varied attainments. But it clearly and unmistakably reveals to us the fact that according to the notions of the time, the Wazīr should possess all the grace of life and all the polish of social intercourse. Nor can we say that such qualifications were not necessary in a man destined for such a high calling.

Less weighty and more limited were the functions of the second Wazīr—the Wāzīr with circumscribed jurisdictional competence. His duty was merely to give effect to the decisions of the Caliph or the Wazīr; to publish the measures of the government; to announce the appointments, notify the preparation for war, and report to the supreme power events and occurrences which had a political colour and interest. On this account, however, it is not to be considered a post of secondary importance. The importance of this office lies in its being the channel through which all the measures, reports and appointments received their authentic and legal character. It bears a close and striking resemblance to the counter-signature of the minister on important state documents under constitutional Governments. The difference in the respective duties of the absolute or the grand Wazīr, and the qualified or the subordinate Wazīr, brought naturally with it differences in personal requirements of the two officers. The qualifications of the grand Wazīr have already been referred to. Now as to the second Wazīr: this officer was a mere instrument of the government, the conduit-pipe, so to speak, between the ruler and the ruled. The qualifications for the holder of

this office, according to Arab jurists, are the following: (1) conscientiousness, (2) punctuality, (3) activity.

Postive knowledge, such as that of law, of theology or of the different branches of the administration, might be completely dispensed with in his case. At all events such an intellectual equipment was not deemed essential in him for the simple reason that in no department of the government did he act on his own initiative. He was the mere instrument of the Caliph and his Wazīr. Māwardī, (see Von Hammer, Vol. VI, pp. 304, 416-418. Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 396. Ibn Khall., Vol. II, p. 224), a writer of the eleventh century of the Christian era, was the first to give expression to the view that a non-Mohamedan was perfectly eligible for the post of the second Wazīr. We do not thereby imply that before the time of Māwardī, non-Muslims were debarred from holding high positions and offices under the Caliphate, but we simply suggest that in Māwardī for the first time this liberal sentiment has found a place, and that in a juristic work. We have said elsewhere that the two most important offices under the Caliphs were those of the wazīr and the kātib, and non-Muslims under more than one Caliph held these high posts. 'Abdu-l-Malik's kātib, Ibn Sarjūn, was a Christian; Abū Isḥāq Aṣ-Ṣābī held the same post under the 'Abbasids, and the Wazīr of 'Aḍhudu-d-Daulah, Narṣ ibn Harwān, was likewise a Christian.

It is to be noted, however, that the Fāṭimites of Egypt also gave effect to this principle and appointed a Jew as their Wazīr. In Suyūṭi's *Husnu-l-Muḥāḍharah* a curious poem is preserved which alludes to it.

"The Jews of our time have reached the goal of their ambition and come to power. To them belong power and authority. Out of them are chosen counsellors and princes. O people of Egypt, I advise you to become Jews, for Heaven itself has become Jewish."[1]

The highly liberal and enlightened sentiment of Māwardī did not, however, pass unassailed or unchallenged. Ibn Jamā'ah, an Egyptian writer of the fifteenth century, speaks very emphatically against the appointment of non-Muslims who enjoyed the protection of Muslims as state officers. It is forbidden, he says, to give any state office to a non-Muslim, with the exception of those offices which are connected with the collection of capitation tax or tolls levied upon non-Muslims. As regards land-tax, or the tenth or other taxes levied upon Muslims, it is forbidden to appoint a non-Muslim. In what a strange contrast does Māwardī stand to Ibn Jamā'ah! (b. 639 H. 1238 A.D., and d. 773 H. 1371 A. D. Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 404, note.) Ibn Khaldūn's opinion on the subject is deserving of attention. He bases his objection to the appointment of non-Muslims, or rather foreigners to such high posts, not on the score of religious prejudice, but upon a far broader and sounder principle—upon the principle that they are not animated or inspired by the same zeal for the welfare of the state as an Arab. He rightly thinks that that strong and permanent bond of community of sentiments and identity of interests which springs from a common nationality is wanting in them; and hence the introduction of foreigners, according to Ibn Khaldūn, was a

[1] Vol. II, p. 117; Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 188.

source of weakness to the Caliphate. "Let us look at the dynasty of the Omayyad, observes Ibn Khaldūn; these princes were supported by such great Arab chiefs as 'Amr, son of Sa'd Ibn Abī Waqqāṣ; 'Ubaidullah, the son of Sa'd Ibn Abū Sufyān; All-Hajjāj, son of Yūsuf; Al Muhallab, son of Abū Ṣufrah; Khālid, son of 'Abdullah Al-Qasrī[1] Ibn Hubairah, Mūsā ibn Nuṣair; Bilāl, son of Abū Burdah, son of Abū Mūsā Al-Ash'ārī; and Naṣr Ibn Sayyār." Then the Caliphs arrogated all the powers to themselves and repressed the ambition of the Arabs who sought high offices, with the result that the Wizārat passed to foreigners and creatures of the Caliph, such as the Bermecides, the Banū Sahl Ibn Naubakht, and the Banū Ṭāhir; then it went to the Buwayhids, and to the emancipated Turks, to Bughā, to Yūsuf, to Atamech, to Bakayah, Ibn Ṭūlūn, and to their children. These men, caring nothing for the permanence and glory of the nation, obtained all the powers.[2] It is, however, to be noted that Khālid Al-Qasrī was a Christian. Religious prejudice, therefore, is not the cause of this change of feeling but deep political insight. It will be impossible to deny or dispute the capability or eminence of some of these ministers, such as the Bermecides or the Banū Sahl Ibn Naubakht but that is beside the mark here.

Another question which engages the attention of the Arab jurists is whether it is possible for several wazīrs exist and act side by side. In the great pressure of

[1] Ibn Khallikān, Vol. I, p. 488; Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 180; Flügel, Mani, pp. 320 sq.

[2] Ibn Khaldūn French trans. Proleg., pp. 373, 374; *cf.* Al-Fakhrī, pp. 176-7.

business and the vast extension of the Empire the need for the division of supreme power must have been clearly felt. Very frequently several wazīrs had to be appointed to cope with the work. The Arab jurists, however, forbid the appointment of several wazīrs (grand wazīrs) at one and the same time except on two conditions: (1) either when the sphere of their work is severely marked and mapped out; (2) or when they all act as one collective person. In this we notice a faint foreshadowing of the English Cabinet system.

A signet was the symbol of the office. The appointment of the wazīrs was as informal as their dismissal. It needed no formal investiture. It can scarcely be doubted that the first stage of this institution was the limited wazīrat; but with the increasing decay and decrepitude of the Caliphate, the unlimited wazīr or the grand wazīr stepped into light. In passing it might be mentioned that in the *Qānūn Nāmah*, or the fundamental laws of the Turks, the four pillars of the government are: the wazīr, the Kazi Asker (the military judge), the Daferder (the finance minister) and the Nichandji (the secretary). The number of the wazīrs is limited to four, but the grand wazīr is entrusted with the seal of the Empire and the insignia of the supreme authority.[1] It is somewhat curious that in the saying ascribed to Ma'mūn—that "there are four most important instruments of the prince; the Qāḍhī (judge), the police officer, the *Sāḥibu-Kharāj* (finance minister), and the postmaster"—the wazīr should have been left out. Possibly

[1] Jonquière, *L'Empire Ottoman*, 181.

because the sun of the wazīrs had not yet risen to its meridian.[1]

Now as to Governorship. Even the Prophet appointed governors for the outlying provinces. The appointment of governors is only too natural, as the sovereign, however vigilant and circumspect, cannot possibly attend to provinces at any distance from the central government. Ibn Khaldūn has very aptly said that the essence of government is the protection of subjects.[2] No ruler of mankind understood this principle better or more thoroughly than the great Caliph Omar Ibn-u-l-Khaṭṭab. He appointed governors, but kept a close watch over them. Under his government, whenever a governor was appointed, he was given a credential, so to speak, which set out the fact of his appointment, specified his duties and carefully marked out his powers. He was enjoined to read it out in public, so that the people might be fully acquainted with his powers and duties. Moreover, an oath was administered to him that he would not indulge in luxuries nor shut his door against the needy, indigent and oppressed.[3] Omar went a step further. In order to ensure a complete control over the conduct of the governors, he created an officer whose sole duty it was to hear complaints against governors. This officer was the celebrated and pious Mohammed ibn Muslimah, one of the most favourite companions of the Prophet. He witnessed almost all the campaigns of Mohammed,

[1] *Ibn-ul-Athīr* (Tonberg's Ed.), Vol. VI, 16, 17.
[2] Prolég., p. 383, French trans.
[3] Prof. Shibli, *Al Farūq*, Part ii, pp. 31, 32.

and during his absence from Medina the Prophet appointed him his representative; a greater honour could not be conceived or conferred upon any companion of the Prophet. Nor did Mohammed ibn Muslimah hold an ornamental post. We shall give here two instances where this officer investigated charges against two important governors. In A. H. 21 complaints were laid against Sa'd bin Waqqāṣ—the victor of Qādisiyyah. In spite of the imminent danger that hung over Iran, Omar deputed Mohammed ibn Muslimah to go to Kūfah and make enquiries. Forthwith he went to Kūfah, investigated the case, and brought Sa'd back with him to Medina, where he was taken to task by Omar. The next case is that of 'Amr Ibnu-l-'Aṣī. Omar wrote to him requiring an explanation of his wealth and property, to which 'Amr replied. But the Caliph, being dissatisfied with his answer, and having heard complaints against him, sent Mohammed ibn Muslimah to Egypt to make investigations. Muslimah obeyed the order of the Caliph, went to Egypt, and took possession of half the property of 'Amr Ibnu-l-'Aṣī for the Baitu-l-Māl (the treasury).[1]

It was this very 'Amr who was also reprimanded by Omar for having built a house at Fusṭāṭ.[2] So anxious was Omar to keep his governors straight and steady, that he would not even allow them to buy land or build houses in their provinces.

We can imagine what the influence of the governors must have come to be under weak or indifferent Caliphs.

[1] Bilādhurī, p. 219; *cf.* Ṭabarī, 2nd Series, p. 202.
[2] Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, Vol. I, p. 117.

If the iron hand of Omar failed to root out administrative abuses, we might, with justice, show some leniency to other Caliphs, if they were unsuccessful in the same effort.

As a check upon the extortionate practices of the governors, Omar introduced the system of *muqāsamah*, that is to say, he caused to be noted down everything that the governors, starting for their provinces possessed, and then he compelled them, on their return, to give back to the treasury half of the sum they brought with them.[1] Omar's insight into human character was profound. He always called Mu'āwiyah the Cæsar of the Arabs, because he knew perfectly well that he was a man of great ambition and little principle. Therefore it was that when Omar appointed him Governor of Damascus, he was shrewd enough to put proper fetters upon Mu'āwiyah's power. He allowed him limited authority. But what must, undoubtedly, have wounded Mu'āwiyah's vanity was that a judge should be sent along with him to preside over the prayers and represent the Caliph in religious matters.[2] Even under 'Uthmān we notice a perceptible and appreciable change in Muslim character. The Caliph was an absolute puppet in the hands of his ambitious kinsmen, who completely led and guided him.

'Uthmān strove to separate the financial from the administrative affairs of the provinces, but this measure proved abortive in some provinces, as the governors would not entertain any such proposal. The Governor of Egypt declined to submit to such terms, for, said he, he would not hold the cow for another to milk it.[3] Charges

[1] Bilādhurī, p. 219.

[2] Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 159.

[3] Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 110.

of intolerance against Muslims are rather frequent in these days, but it might be interesting to know that they went much further in their spirit of tolerance and forbearance than even the rulers of the modern age. Instances are not wanting of governors being appointed at the choice of the people. Here is one taken from Bilādhurī's *Futūḥu-l-Buldān.*[1] It is said that the Prophet deposed 'Alā, the Governor of Baḥrain and appointed in his place Abān Ibn Sa'd. When the Prophet died, Abān returned to Medina from Baḥrain and the people of Baḥrain requested Abū Bakr to send 'Alā' back, and the Caliph did so. 'Alā' thus remained the Governor of Baḥrain until his death (A. H. 20). But after 'Uthmān things went from bad to worse. We read of governors, under the Omayyads, remaining at Court and having their provinces administrated by a *nā'ib* appointed by them. When Hishām appointed his brother Maslamah Governor of the United Provinces of Armenia and Ādharbaijān, he, instead of discharging his duties, got some one else to do them for him.[2]

A few words as to the theory of governorship. Governorship, like wizārat, is divided into two classes—one which is limited in its powers and the other which is unlimited and undefined in its powers. The latter is almost akin to sovereignty. In the very earliest period of Islam, which is the period of the Prophet, of Abū Bakr and partially of Omar, one seldom thought of separating the spiritual from the temporal authority, so much so that governors were not merely entrusted with the adminis-

[1] P. 81.

[2] Von Kremer, Vol. I, p. 181.

tration of the province but, what was far more important to them, were also the representatives, in religious matters, of the High Priest of Islam. They preached every Friday in the mosque, they presided at the prayers, and were, in the literal sense of the word, the Legates of the religious chief of Islam. But when foreign influence began to exert itself upon Muslim thought, different branches of the government began to be separated from one another. As early as Omar, we have the administrative, the fiscal, the judiciary—different branches of the government—all separate and distinct. Each had its own staff quite apart from the other. It is after the separation of the various departments of the government that we see the difference between the limited and the unlimited governor in bold contrast. The unlimited governor was appointed directly by the Caliph. He stood at the head of the army, he administered justice, appointed judges, collected taxes and Zakāt (poor tax), defrayed the expenses of the administration, explained and interpreted religious ordinances, punished infringements of religious laws, presided at public prayers and was the commander-in-chief of the amy.[1]

We have already noticed that when, under Omar, Mu'āwiyah was sent as Governor to Damascus, he was invested with very limited powers. To turn to limited governorship, it consisted in the governor bearing command over the troops and carrying on the administrative work, but neither exercising judicial functions nor pre-

[1] Von Kremer, *Gesch. der herrschenden Ideen des Islams*, pp. 419-423; Māwardī, pp. 47-48.

siding over the financial department, nor representing the Caliph in religious matters.

We, therefore, naturally conclude that like the unlimited wizārat, unlimited governorship also came into being when the Caliphs lost, wholly or partially, their hold over the reins of government. We should err if we were to say that the Caliphs did not realise, and that, indeed, at a comparatively early period, the dangers to be apprehended from the governors, for we agree with Sprenger, that it was precisely for this reason that they sought, by means of an elaborate postal service, to keep themselves continually informed of the affairs in the provinces and the conduct of the governors.

This, indeed, did little either to promote the interest of the Caliph or to stave off the inevitable. Just as, according to Ibn Khaldūn, there is a constant tendency in oriental kingship towards absolutism, so doubtless the efforts of the governors tended always towards as much independence as possible from the central government. We then have a most woeful picture of disorder and weakness. Governors cut themselves adrift from the central government or own only a shadowy allegiance to the Caliph.

The Ṭāhirides had succeeded even under Ma'mūn in making their governorship hereditary in their family, but more by persuasion than by force. Here is what Al-Fakhrī says of the Caliphate under Ar-Rāḍhī : " At the time of Ar-Rāḍhī a great weakness had come over the Caliphate. Persia was in the hands of 'Alī Ibn Buwaih ; Rayy, Iṣfahān and Jabal in those of his brother Ḥusain Ibn Buwaih ; Mosul, Diyār Bakr, Diyār Rabī'ah and

Muḍ in the hands of the two branches of the Ḥamdānites; Egypt and Syria in the hands of Mohammed Ibn Ṭūlūn. Then they passed under the Fāṭimites; Spain in the hands of 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān Ibn Mohammed, the Omayyad; Khurāsān and the Eastern territories in the hands of Naṣr ibn Mohammed, the Sāmānide."[1]

At the time of the first crusade the disorders and anarchy in Syria, Asia Minor and Mesopotamia were simply frightful. A portion of Asia Minor was under Qilij Arslān, another under Qimishtākīm. In Mesopotamia, the then Sovereign of Persia appointed Karboga the Governor of Mosul, but he soon threw off his yoke, made himself independent, and won over to himself the generality of the Amīrs of the country round about. Syria was infinitely worse than any other province. It had as many principalities, with independent governors, as it had towns, and moreover every principality was at war with its neighbour. Rādwān and Daqqāq, sons of Tutush, ruled Aleppo and Damascus. While Bagu Sian had Antioch under him. Māwardī lived at a time when the Imperial power was completely exhausted and paralysed, and the Caliph had become a mere phantom, a shadow of his former self.

Hence it is that he says that there is a third kind of governorship; governorship by usurpation (Imāratu-l-Istīlā). This, indeed, was a sorrowful generalisation from actual facts.

This meant nothing more or less than this: political adventurers wrested provinces from the lawful authorities,

[1] Al-Fakhrī, pp. 328-329.

retained[1] them by force of arms and denied the authority of the Caliph. When driven to straits the Caliph acknowledged and confirmed them in their dominion on condition of their owning his spiritual and religious supremacy. Māwardī gives a number of conditions which he deemed necessary for the confirmation of the Caliph.[2]

We must not omit to mention that it was the union of the spiritual and temporal powers in the Caliph that prolonged the life of the Caliphate for so long. Had it not been so, the Caliphate could hardly have continued for more than a couple of centuries.

The political power passed out of the hands of the Caliph; still his person remained surrounded with a halo of romance and sanctity, which the boldest adventurer and the most successful general respected and revered.[3] Even those who had made good their right over a province or a kingdom by the strength of their arm thought it necessary to solicit the confirmation of the Caliph to give an air of legitimacy to their authority.

The title of *Maliku-d-Daulah* was the subject of a long diplomatic negotiation between the Caliph Al-Qādir and the King Abū Kālījūr[4] in which the celebrated and learned Māwardī acted as the Ambassador of the Caliph. The King wanted nothing less than the title of the great Sultan, ruler of the nations (As-Sulṭānu-l-Mu'adhdham

[1] Michaud, *Bibliothèque des Croisades*, Vol. IV, pp. 2-3.

[2] Māwardī, pp. 51-53.

[3] How the spiritual side of the Caliphate was emphasized when its political power declined see Goldziher, Moh Studien., Vol. II, p. 60 *et seq.*

[4] Von Kremer, *Herrsch. Ideen*, p. 418 (note); Weil, *Gesch. d. Islam*, Vol. III, p. 78.

Maliku-l-Umam), but Māwardī declined to accede to his request on the ground that the Caliph alone was the great Sultan and ruler of nations. At last the King contented himself with the title of *Maliku-d-Daulah* and sent, through Māwardī, rich presents to the Caliph.

The following anecdote, taken from *Ibnu-l-Athīr*, will convey to us some idea of the greatness of the Caliph even in the declining days of the Caliphate.[1] When Malik Shā, that mighty prince who once more revived the glory of the Muslim Empire and the splendour of the Caliphate, went to Baghdād to receive the investiture from the Caliph, he desired at the close of the ceremony to kiss the hand of the High Pontiff of Islam, but he was refused that honour and was only given the signet to kiss. But all these pageants and shows thinly disguised the absolute political impotence of the Caliph. The glorious days of Islam were already over. These were the days of servitude without love, of dwarfish talents and gigantic vices.

[1] *Ibn-u-l-Athīr*, Vol. X, p. 104.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF MUSLIM LEARNING[1]

It is my settled conviction that the only way in which we can oppose the downward tendencies and brace up again the slackened sinews of the Muslims is by reviving the study of Muslim literature and Muslim history. The modern Muslims can never plead the want of a shining light. Their predecessors have left a name " to point a moral and adorn a tale " and both the moral and the tale are well worth taking to heart. To my mind it is imperative that we should direct our attention towards our neglected studies and, if I may say so, our neglected duties as well. For our duty it is to acquaint ourselves with our history, with the true interpretation of our religion, and last but not least with Arabic literature, which is second to none in vastness and importance. Though abandoned and neglected now, Muslim learning unquestionably engraved a deep mark on the history of the Middle Ages, since Muslims it was who then occupied a hegemonic position with regard to intellectual movements.

It is a just observation of Hammer Pürgstall that with the birth of Islam begins the history of the Arabs as well as the proper history of their literature. But in dealing with my subject it will involve a dereliction of duty or perhaps an obscurity of vision to leave out of account the literary triumphs of the Arabs in " the days of ignorance". Modest as were those performances they

[1] A paper read at Patna.

hang together with the subsequent literary triumph of the Muslims.

Shahristānī—the author of a famous work on religious and philosophic sects—observes that there were four chief studies of the Arabs before Islam :—genealogy, history, the interpretation of dreams and the *science* of stars. Within such limits much was done by the Pre-Islamite Arabs. The kings of Ḥīrah and Ghassān offered ready and willing patronage to letters, and even themselves studied and composed poetry; the efforts of some of these being by no means mean or insignificant. Mundhir was conspicuous for his political talent, and at the court of his son ' Amr lived two poets of considerable fame, named Al-Mutalammis and Ṭarafah; the latter being the author of one of the Mu'allaqāt. Mundhir's successor Nu'mān was lavish in presents to the poets An-Nābighah and Labīd and received with open arms the hero-poet Molaibelessinet. The last king of the Banū Ghassān, Jabalahibnu-l-Anham, who lived right up to the time of the Caliph Omar, was a distinguished poet. But the king who far surpassed the others in the poetical world and who still shines serenely in the intellectual firmament was Imru'u-l-Qais. He mounted the throne of Al-Ḥīrah in 505 or 506 A.D., and held it till 554.[1]

To Ḥīrah, moreover, Arabic owes a debt of gratitude for its art of writing, " which came from Ḥīrah or Anbār to Ḥijāz, and only a century later, after Kūfah had been founded by the Caliph Omar, received the name of Kūfic character."[2]

[1] Sir Charles Lyall, *Ancient Arabian Poetry*, p. 104.

[2] Hammer Pürgstall, *Literaturgeschichte der Araber*, Vol. I, p. 29; Ibn Khallikān, *Biographical Dictionary*, Vol. II, p. 284.

It is agreed that the art of writing came into Arabia only a very short time before the birth of Islam. Though, at one time, scholars held exaggerated opinions on the antiquity of Arabic literature, yet it is now fully established that " the oldest monuments of Arabic literature which we still possess were composed within the century which preceded the birth of Mahomed. They consist of short pieces of verse uttered on the spur of the moment, narrations of combats between hostile tribes, passages in rhythmical prose and *Qaṣīdahs* or elegies."[1] The taste for poetry was the common ground of the highest as well as the lowest strata of Arab society. Each tribe vied with the other for supremacy in poetry. Witness the collection of the poems of the tribe of Hudhail made by As-Sukkarī and other collections like those of Al-Mufaḍhdhaliyyāt and Al-Ḥamāsah.

Genealogy was a favourite study of the Arabs, as Shahristānī points out, but its serious study was doubtless connected with the system of register for the pay and pensions of the faithful started by the Caliph Omar.[2] In this branch of study the names of the two Kalbīs and Bilādhurī stand out in prominence. Bilādhurī's Ansābu-l-Ashrāf is a history of the Arabs on a genealogical plan. Besides poetry the pre-Islamite Arabs evinced a decided taste for tales—a fact not at all uncommon in the infancy of the human race—and Abū 'Ubaidah "as the teller of the stories of the pagan days " was without an equal.

Tradition relates that, when Mahomed appeared before Mekka and the city lay helpless at his feet, Abū

[1] Ibn Khall., Vol. I, Introd., pp. 15 and 16.

[2] Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 6.

Sufyān called out to Abu-l-'Abbās that against such a power no arm could avail. "The kingdom of thy nephew has become great," said he to 'Abbās. "No," replied the latter, "it is not a kingdom but a prophetic investiture."[1] Nor was Abū Sufyān altogether beside the mark, for like the prophets of Israel, Mohammed united in himself various functions, *viz.*, those of the prophet, the empire-builder and the legislator. The intellectual training of his people, be it noted, did not escape the attention of the Prophet, and it is said that he set the captives at Badr to ransom themselves by teaching writing to his ignorant converts.[2] Moreover Mohammed was never weary of impressing upon his followers the necessity of acquiring knowledge, and tradition has preserved many of his sayings in reference thereto. The sayings of 'Alī are no less worthy of note. To 'Alī are ascribed the following dicta:—"Eminence in Science is the highest of honours," and "He dies not who gives life to learning." "The greatest ornament of man is erudition." Further, it was at the instance of the Caliph 'Alī that Al-Aswad ad-Du'alī drew up the rules for reading and speaking the Arabic language correctly. Khalīl, later on, fixed the rules of prosody, and in the cities of Baṣrah and Kūfah the pure literary activity of the Muslims burst into an extraordinary richness of bloom. In those two cities the rival schools of grammarians, with Kisā'ī and Sībawaih at their head, carried on the development of Arabic literature.

To pass on to the Omayyads. With the rise of Mu'āwiyah the strong religious colour which was con-

[1] Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, Vol. V, p. 88.
[2] Johnson, *Oriental Religion*, p. 580.

spicuous in the rule of the four Caliphs almost entirely passed away and a purely temporal policy was adopted. But, however worldly the policy of the Omayyads may have been, and a historian will hardly find fault with it as such, there is not a shadow of historic doubt as to their being patron of letters. I emphatically dissent from the author of the *Spirit of Islam*, when he says "that whilst the Omayyads discouraged the peaceful pursuits of the mind, the children of Fāṭimah with characteristic liberalism favoured learning,"[1] and I regard it as opposed to the maturer verdict of history. Instances are on record of Omayyad Caliphs who both discouraged learning and brought discredit on Islam—sovereigns like Walīd II, Yazīd III and Marwān II—but I repeat that the harsh judgment passed against the entire Omayyad Dynasty is not in keeping with the accepted testimony of history. Even among the 'Abbāsides we find sovereigns like Mustanjid and Muqtadir, who cast a melancholy shadow on the splendour of the reigns of Manṣūr, Hārūn and Ma'mun. Whatever else may be said against the Omayyads of Damascus, they can justly claim the honour of having nursed Muslim learning in its infancy.

Mu'āwiyah—the founder of the dynasty—possessed a large heart and a liberal mind. His attitude towards his Christian subjects stands in marked contrast to the narrow-minded bigotry of the Byzantine Cæsars. We find him welcoming to his court the Christian physician Ibn Athal, who translated for him several medical books into Arabic.[2] No less to his credit is the fact that he

[1] Ameer Ali, *Spirit of Islam*, p. 587.
[2] Professor Shiblī, *Essays*, p. 20.

sent for Abid from San'ā' to Damascus to relate to him the history of the kings of Yaman, and further prevailed upon him to place his recital in a permanent form.[1] His son and successor Yazīd, who enjoys a very unenviable fame in Muslim history, was a poet of no small merit. Khālid ibn Yazīd was fondly attached to learning. Among others Stephen and Marianos were employed by him for the translation of books into Arabic.

By their patronage indeed Greek and Coptic books became accessible to the Arabic reading public. Khālid was himself an author, and Ibn Nadīm in his *Kitābu-l-Fihrist* actually gives us a list of the books he wrote. Ibn Abī Uṣaibi'ah—a much earlier writer than Ibn Khaldūn—speaks very highly of the attainments of Khālid. In the face of authorities like Ibn Abī Uṣaibi'ah and Ibn Nadīm it is impossible to attach any importance to the opinion of Ibn Khaldūn who throws doubts upon the literary works of Khālid ibn Yazīd.

Professor Shiblī holds that it was under *Marwān* that translations from Syriac were made by Māsarjawaiah, but Leclerc places it under Omar ibn 'Abdi-l-'Azīz.[2] The present writer must leave this question undecided. Omar ibn 'Abdi-l-'Azīz was drawn towards Greek learning during his Governorship of Egypt under Sulaimān ibn 'Abdi-l-Malik. In Egypt he made the acquaintance of one Ibn Abjar—the teacher of Greek philosophy at Alexandria. The friendship proved long and lasting, and when Omar ibn 'Abdi-l-

[1] Wüstenfeld, *Geschichtschreiber der Araber*, p. 2.

[2] Shibī, *Essays*, p. 166; Leclerc, *Hist. de la Medicine Arabe*, Vol. I, p. 124.

'Azīz rose to the Caliphate, he made Ibn Abjar the chief of the Medical Department. Ibn 'Abī Uṣaibi'ah informs us that, under Omar ibn 'Abdi-l-'Azīz, Greek learning was transferred from Egypt to Antioch and Ḥarrān, whence it spread to other Muslim countries. Professor Shiblī is perhaps correct in thinking that this was due to the retirement of Ibn Abjar from Alexandria. Other circumstances doubtless combined in helping on the translation of books into Arabic from foreign languages; for instance, a class of men had come into existence who knew Arabic as well as some foreign languages to prefection, men like Ṣāliḥ ibn 'Abdur-r-Raḥmān and 'Abdullah ibn 'Abdi-l-Malik.

But not until the time of Ma'Mūn do we find the literary movements in their full swing. Hishām ibn 'Abdi-l-Malik, unquestionably one of the ablest of the Omayyad sovereigns, was at once a warrior and a scholar. To his Chief Secretary Sālim, a celebrated linguist, tradition refers as a translator of some of Aristotle's works. Jabalah—the son of Sālim—inherited to the fullest extent the literary capacity of his father and is known to history as a translator of some Persian historical works into Arabic. Ibn Nadīm has mentioned some of his works. Hishām was intensely interested in the literary works of other nations, and it is related that among the literary treasures of the Persians which fell into the hands of the Muslims there was a complete and comprehensive history of the Persians with the portraits of the sovereigns therein mentioned. At the instance of the Caliph Hishām this work was translated into Arabic in A.H. 113. The historian Mas'ūdī tells us that he saw this book in A.H. 303 at Iṣṭakhr.

The marvellous 'Abdul-l-Qāsim Ḥammād enjoyed the favour of the Caliphs Walīd Ibn 'Abdi-l-Malik and Hishām. His memory was stupendous, and it is reported that at one sitting he recited two thousand nine hundred *Qaṣīdahs*, being one hundred for every letter of the alphabet, all of which had been composed by poets who flourished before Mohammed. It is impossible, says Chenery, to doubt the services of these Caliphs, particularly in preserving the compositions of the past, which were in danger of being lost through the fall of so many of the reciters in the ceaseless wars.[1] In A. H. 125 died Hishām and with him practically ended the glory of the Omayyads in Asia. The Omayyads cannot be charged with having been indifferent to the advancement of learning. Let us never forget that it was they who opened the path for further progress the 'Abbāsides did but rear a magnificent superstructure upon the foundation laid by them. Moreover it was a member of this very family who founded the Caliphate of Cordova and made Spain the centre of light and learning during the Middle Ages, not merely for the East but the West as well.

The 'Abbāsides entered upon the vast heritage of the Omayyads, and in a short space of time indeed excelled them. With the rise of the 'Abbāsides the energies of the youthful nation were drawn into new channels. Fresh vistas of intellectual activity were opened out, and we contemplate with satisfaction the beginning of history proper, jurisprudence, philosophy and other exact sciences. The wholesale importance of Greek and Persian civilization urged onward the literary impulse under

[1] Chenery, Harīrī, Introd., p. 17.

the 'Abbāsides; but such external influences were not without their Nemesis. If they widened for a time the sphere of intellectual activity, they at the same time sowed that seed of corruption which in process of time enervated and enfeebled the Muslims, and finally destroyed their empire and their learning.

From three sources mainly the stream of Grecian learning made its way into the Arabian field. Since the days of Alexander the Great, the land between the Euphrates and the Tigris had come under the influence of the Hellenic culture. When the news of the death of the Crassus reached the Court of the Parthian king, Orodes, it found him watching one of the tragedies of Euripides, and in A.D. 5 we hear of the Sassanide Khusrū Anū-shirwān founding an academy at Jundaisābūr in Khūzistān, which, in spite of the fall of the Persian kingdom, continued in a flourishing condition for three centuries after the Sassanides. At this academy Grecian philosophy and medicine were taught and practised.

Next to the academy at Jundaisābūr come the Syrians of Mesopotamia as the preceptors of the Arabs in the philosophy and medicine of the Greeks. Grecian philosophy took such a deep root among them that even their conception of Christianity in no small measure was coloured by it. The far-reaching consequences of their creed-spinning capacity are familiar to every student of Byzantine history and I need not dwell upon them here. Coming constantly in contact with the Greek doctors of the Roman and Byzantine periods they had learnt, understood, and made use of the writings of Aristotle and the works of the Greek physicians, naturalists, and mathe-

maticians like Hippocrates, Galen, Dioscorides, Euclid and the Almagest of Ptolemy. In the cloisters between Antioch and Mosul these Syrians patiently worked and translated the Greek works into their mother-tongue, and Müller says that "for one who is conversant with both the languages it would be possible to make out the sense of the original through the Syriac translation."[1]

The inhabitants of Ḥarrān—the only people in Syria who stood fast by their religion—are the main source to which the Arabs owe their knowledge of Greek culture and civilization. They had this superiority over the others that they possessed an accurate knowledge of the Arabic language, and hence their translations are far more faithful. Thus to the academy at Jundaisābūr, the Mesopotamian monks and the inhabitants of Ḥarrān, the Arabs looked up for intellectual guidance, and through them mainly Greek learning was brought home to the Muslims. The foundation-stone of the glory of the 'Abbāsides was laid by the Caliph Manṣūr. Under him lived the real founders of Arabian philology, the Persian Sībawaih and the Arab Khalil in Baṣrah and Al-Kisā'ī of equal fame in Kūfah. The merits of Al-Kisā'ī were acknowledged by the Caliph, who rewarded him with the appointment of tutor to his son Al-Mahdī. In Manṣūr's time the encyclopædist Aṣma'ī, a marvel of memory, commenced his collection of the old Arabian poems.

In 143 A.H., according to Adh-Dhahabī, the doctors of Islam began to compose works on tradition, juris-

[1] Müller, *Der Islam im morgen unb abendland*, Vol. I, p. 510, about Ḥarrān. See Sprenger, Murūju-dh-Dhahab (English trans.), p. 218; Travels of Nassiri Khusrau, French trans., p. 29, note (1).

prudence and the interpretation of the Qur'ān;—Ibn Juraij wrote at Mekka, Mālik composed the Muwaṭṭa' at Medina. Al-Auzā'ī wrote in Syria, Ibn Abī 'Arūbah, Ḥammād ibn Salamah and others in Baṣrah, Ma'mar in Yaman and Sufyān Ath-Thaurī in Kūfah.[1] In A.H. 148 Manṣūr fell seriously ill, and the physicians of his court gave up his case in despair. But, hearing of his cleverness, the Caliph sent for George, the Superintendent of the Jundaisābūr Academy, and under his treatment recovered. After that the academicians of Jundaisābūr acquired and retained a permanent footing at the Caliph's court. George's grandson, the celebrated Gabriel, was the court physician of Hārūn.

During the reign of Manṣūr falls also the career of the industrious Ibn-u-l-Muqaffa, a perfect master of Arabic and Persian. His translation of *Kalīlah wa Dimnah* marks the beginning of the literature of romance among the Arabs, a beginning which finds its culmination in the *Arabian Nights*, the delight of the East and the West alike.

Ibn-u-l-Muqaffa' also translated into Arabic the Shāh Nāmah, which contained the history of the Princes and the heroes of Irān. It was this work which served as a basis for the unparalleled epic of Firdausī. The rationalistic movement, which dated back to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, received a fresh impulse under the new conditions of life in the early days of the 'Abbāsides, and in Abu-l-Hudhail Al-'Allāf it found a stout champion. He gave shape to the rationalistic theories of free-will and the

[1] Suyūṭī, *History of the Caliphs*, p. 266.

ideal conception of Divinity. The best index to the liberalism of the times is found in the interest which the Caliph Manṣūr showed in the religious books of other nations, and Mas'ūdī tells us that in his reign the religious doctrines of Mānī, the works of Ibn Daisān and Marcian, for the first time, became accessible to the Muslims.[1] It is astonishing to note that even Sanskrit books were done into Arabic, for instance the Sindhind (*Siddhanta*); nor was Aristotle, the chief authority on mediæval philosophy, neglected in the reign of Manṣūr.

It redounds to the credit of Ibn-u-l-Muqaffa' that he was almost the first to attempt an exposition of Aristotle's logic, and thereby to furnish the Muslims with the invaluable weapon of mediæval dialectic. But side by side with advanced rationalism flowed the stream of unbending orthodoxy. Even the omnipotent Ma'mūn felt unable to cope with the orthodox school, and his measure of A.H. 218 (217?) to proclaim the doctrine of the creation of the Qur'ān hopelessly failed in its effect.

Within almost the first decade of the 'Abbāside Dynasty the fabric of Muslim jurisprudence was begun and completed. Abū Ḥanīfah concluded his system of jurisprudence under Manṣūr, Mālik and Shāfi'ī under Hārūn, and Aḥmad Ibn Hanbal under Ma'mūn. The reign of Mahdī has little to show. The Caliph was most anxiously occupied with destroying heresy root and branch. The mantle of Manṣūr, however, fell on Hārūn.

[1] Mos'ūdī, Murūju-dh-Dhahab, Vol. VIII, p. 293 (Paris Edition) about Sindhind. See a valuable note of Sprenger in his translation of Murūju-dh-Dhahab, p. 154.

By his time a large store of books had been already collected and learning had made considerable advance among the populace. With a twofold purpose Hārūn established the Baitu-l-Ḥikmah: to preserve the books already collected and to help onward the further progress of learning.

To do the work efficiently he appointed experts in the Baitu-l-Ḥikmah. Faḍhl ibn Naubakht was given charge of the Persian books and Yūḥannā Ibn Māsawaih of Jundaisābūr, entrusted with the Greek books which Hārūn had brought with him from his campaign in Asia Minor. Hārūn showed extreme liberality towards learned men. He bestowed on " One occasion on Sufyān ibn ' Uyai-nah one hundred thousand dirhems and on another two hundred thousand on Ishāq of Mosul, and he gave Marwān ibn Abī Ḥafṣah for a poem five thousand dinars, a robe of honor, a horse from his own stud and ten Greek Slaves." [1]

The splendid galaxy of learned men who gathered round him like the Barmecides, the Qāḍhī Abū Yūsuf and the Poets Marwān ibn Abī Ḥafṣah, and Abū Nu'ās and many others besides, shed a brilliant lustre on his reign. Hārūn, unlike Ma'mūn, belonged to the orthodox school. It is related that when the opinion of Marrisi on the creation of the Qur'ān was mentioned to him, he exclaimed, " If I catch him, I will strike off his head." A mightly change, to be sure, passed over the Muslims on the accession of Ma'mūn, inasmuch as the Commander of the Faithful himself then dared to proclaim the doctrine of the creation of the Qur'ān and de-

[1] Suyūṭī, p. 293.

mand from the Qāḍhīs a formal assent to it.[1] Imām Ibn Ḥanbal vigorously opposed the heretical innovation, but some of the leading jurists unhesitatingly subscribed to the opinion of Ma'mūn.

[1] The further development of the Mutazilite doctrine is admirably summed up by Dozy (Chauvir's French transl., pp. 205-207). Browne, pp. 286-287.

This doctrine was subsequently remodelled and propagated under the influence of the Philosophy of Aristotle. The sect, as was in the nature of things, subdivided. All the Mutazilites, however, agreed in certain points. They denied the existence of the attributes in God, and contested everything which could prejudice the dogma of the Divine unity. To remove from God all idea of injustice, they recognized man's entire freedom of action. They taught that all the truths necessary for salvation belong to the domain of reason and they may be acquired solely by the light of reason, no less before than after Revelation, in such wise that man at all times and in all places ought to possess these truths. But to these primary propositions the different sects added others peculiar to themselves. Most of them have treated theology with much profundity; others, on the contrary, became involved in hair-splittings, or even diverged widely from the spirit of Islam. Some there were, for example, who believed in Metempsychosis, and who imagined that the animals of each species form a community which has a prophet an animal like unto themselves; strange to say they based this last doctrine on two verses of the Qur'ān. And there were many other follies of the same kind. But it would be unjust to render all the Mutazilites responsible for the errors of some, and, when all is said and done, they deserve to be spoken of with respect. In meditating what religion bade them believe, they became the rationalists of Islam. Thus it came about that one of their principal affirmations was that the Qur'ān was really created, although the Prophet had asserted the contrary. 'Were the Qur'ān uncreated,' they said, 'it would be necessary to admit the existence of two Eternal Beings.' From the moment when the Qur'ān or word of God, was held as something created, it could no longer, having regard to the immutability of the Deity, be considered as belonging to His essence. Thereby the whole dogma of revelation was little by little seriously shaken, and many Mutazilites frankly declared that it was not impossible to write something as good as, or even better than, the Qur'ān. They therefore protested against the dogma of the divine origin of the Qur'ān and against Inspiration. The idea which they entertained of God was purer and more exalted than that of the orthodox. They would not listen to any corporeal conception of the Divinity. Mohammed had said, 'one day ye shall see your Lord as you saw the full moon at the Battle of Badr,'

The reign of Ma'mūn, nevertheless constitutes the most glorious period in the history of Islam, as far as literary activity is concerned. Symptoms of administrative weakness, doubtless, manifested themselves and the

and these words, which the orthodox took literally, were for them an ever new stumbling-block. They, therefore, explained them away by saying that man, after his death, would know God by the eyes of the spirit, that is to say, by the reason. They equally refused to countenance the pretension that God created the unbeliever, and showed themselves but little pleased with the consecrated formula which says of God that 'He hurteth and He advantageth.' They could not admit the miracles related in the Qur'ān, and so denied that the sea was dried up to yield a passage for the Israelites led by Moses, that Moses' rod was changed into a serpent, and that Jesus raised the dead to life. Mohammed himself did not escape their attacks. There was one sect which maintained that the Prophet married too many wives, and that his contemporary, Abu Dharr al-Ghifori, had much more self-restraint and piety than he, which also was perfectly true.

The following extract from Steiner's "Die Mutaziliten oder die Freidenker im Islam" is equally interesting. We may venture to assert, says Steiner (p. 5), that the Mutazilites were the first who not only read the translations of the Greek Naturalists and Philosophers prepared under the auspices of Al-Mansur and Al-Ma'mun (A.D. 754—775 and 813—833) and evolved therefrom all sorts of useful knowledge, but likewise exerted themselves to divert into new channels their entire thoughts, which had hitherto moved only in the narrow circle of ideas of the Qur'ān, to assimilate to their own uses the Greek culture and to combine it with their Muslim conscience. The philosophers proper, Al-Farābī (d. A.D. 950), Ibn Sina (d. A.D. 1037), and Ibn Rushd (d. 1198), belong to a later age. Al-Kindi (d. A.D. 864) was the earliest and lived somewhat before them, but seems to have devoted special attention to precisely those problems raised by the Mutazilites. His followers, however, avoided theological questions. Without directly assailing the faith they avoided all conflict with it, so far as possible. Theology and Natural Science, including Philosophy, were treated as separate territories with the harmonizing of which no further trouble was taken. Ibn Sina appears to have been a pious Muslim, yet Shahrāstanī includes him amongst those who properly belonged to no definite confession, but standing outside Positive Religion, evolved their ideas out of their own heads. Ibn Rushd also is accounted a good Muslim. He endeavoured to show that philosophical research was not only allowed, but was a duty, and one enjoined even by the Qur'ān; but for the rest, he goes his own way, and his writings are, with few exceptions, of philosophic and scientific contents. Thus was the breach between philosophy

signs of the time boded ill for the cohesion and maintenance of the powerful kingdom. The central government found itself unequal to the task of keeping the provincial governors at bay, and indeed the splendour of the court of Ma'mūn did but thinly veil the weakness of the Caliphate of Baghdād. Witness the history of the Ṭāhirīte Dynasty. In course of time, the Caliph became a mere forlorn shadow decked in the trappings of dignity. Ma'mūn was equally devoted to pure literature, to philosophy, and to the exact sciences. It has been truly said that all the intellectual movements of the Islamic countries could eventually be traced back to the reign of Ma'mūn. Born of a Persian mother, the Caliph had a natural bias towards Persian culture and civilization. This tendency was strongly emphasised during his stay at Merv in the earlier days of his Caliphate. He went the length of taking as his model the Sassānide kings and particularly Ardashīr, whom he strove to follow and imitate in every point. Fascinated by the study of their ancient books, he applied himself to the further study and preservation of Persian culture and civilization.[1] The Baitu-l-Ḥikmah, founded by his father, was under him largely extended and improved. Many-sided was Ma'mūn's culture. Not merely Persian but also Greek

and dogma already fully established with Ibn Sina. The Mutazilite party had exhausted its strength in the subtle controversies of the schools of Baṣrah and Baghdad. Abu'l-Husyan of Baṣrah, a contemporary of Ibn Sina, was the last who gave independent treatment to their teaching, and in some points completed it. Zamakhshari (A.D. 1143—4), the famous and extraordinarily learned author of the Kashshaf, reduced the moderate ideas of his predecessors to a pleasant and artistic form, and applied them consistently and adroitly to the whole region of Qur'ānic exigesis, but gave to the teaching itself no further development.

[1] Mas'ūdī, Vol. VIII, pp. 300-1.

books had a fascination for him. He sent a deputation to Leo the Armenian with the object of obtaining Greek books for his own use as well as that of his subjects. The Cæsar, though reluctant, consented. At this time Ḥunain and Ya'qūb-Al-Kindī were pre-eminently fitted for translating Greek books into Arabic. Ḥunain had studied Greek at Alexandria and Arabic under Khalīl of Baṣrah. Well-versed in these languages, he commenced, under the instruction of Ma'mūn, the translation of Greek books. His scholarship and industry won for him the favour of his master, and Ma'mūn was never tired of bestowing gifts on him. Being a lover of books himself, Ḥunain travelled throughout Asia Minor and Syria in search of books. Ptolemy's treatise on judicial astrology entitled *Tetrabiblion* was first put into Arabic by Ibrāhīm Ibn Ṣalt and then revised and corrected by Ḥunain Ibn Isḥāq.[1] Ma'mūn was profoundly interested in astronomy, and it was at his instance that Yaḥyā Ibn Abī Manṣūr Al-Ma'mūnī, the author of the astronomical tables called Az-Zīju-l-Mumtahin and of a work, apparently astrological, called Kitābu-l-'Amal,[2] made astronomical observations at Ash Sham māsiyyah near Baghdād and at Mount Kaisym near Damascus in the years 215 (A.D. 830), 216 and 217 of the A.H., but the death of Ma'mūn brought these efforts to an untimely end. Again, it was at the request of the Caliph Ma'mūn that the measurement of the earth was undertaken by Mahomed Ibn Mūsā Ibn Shākir.[3] Now to turn to Al-Kindī, who has been styled the philosopher of the Arabs.

[1] Ibn Khall., Vol. III, p. 320, note (3).
[2] Ibn Khall., Vol. II, p. 366, note (3).
[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 315.

He counted among his ancestors the princes of Yamāmah and Baḥrain. At one time it was thought that he was of Jewish origin, but De Sacy has conclusively proved the fact of his Arabian extraction. His father was the Governor of Kūfah under the Caliphs Al-Mahdī and Hārūn, and by closely studying the works of the Greeks, Persians and Indians dealing with philosophy, medicine and mathematics, Al-Kindī won the esteem and favour of Ma'mūn and Mu'taṣim. Abu-l-Faraj calls him a contemporary of Qusṭā ibn Lūkā. A complete list of Al-Kīndī's works will be found on page 22 of the *Geschichte der Arabischen Ærzte* of Dr. Wüstenfeld. For the translation of the Persian books Ma'mūn made an equally efficient arrangement. He entrusted Sahl ibn Herway with this part of the work. It is a matter of deep regret that the reign of this philosopher Caliph was cut short by an untimely death. It is left to conjecture and to conjecture alone what would have been the additions to the stock of human knowledge, had Ma'mūn been allowed a longer lease of life.

Al-Mu'taṣim was more of a warrior than a scholar, and we have to wait till the reign of Al-Wāthiq Billāh for the thread of the literary activity to be taken up again. Al-Wāthiq, a tolerant prince, devoted his attention to the translation of foreign books. No religious persecution disfigures his reign. Yāḥannā Ibn Māsawaih, whom we have met already, became his righthand man, and Wāthiq showered endless presents on him. Mas'ūdī tells us that on one occasion he gave him *dirhems* amounting to three lakhs.

Al-Mutawakkil Billāh, his successor, did not share the advanced views of Al-Wāthiq, still he promoted the

study and translation of foreign books. After Al-Mutawakkil the 'Abbāsides fell on evil times. The history of the 'Abbāsides has been rightly divided into five periods : of extreme brilliance ending with Ma'mūn ; the period of the supremacy of the Turkish body-guard terminating in 334 (A.D. 946), when Mu'izzu-d-Daulah, the Buwaihid prince, became master of Baghdād ; the period of the Buwaihid supremacy, followed by the Seljukian supremacy, beginning with Ṭughrul who entered Baghdād in 447 (A.D. 1055), and ending with the death of Sultan Sanjar ; lastly, the period of decline and decrepitude winding up with the sack of Baghdād by the Moguls in 656 (A.D. 1258), and the death of the last 'Abbāside Caliph, Al Musta'ṣim.[1]

To dwell at length on the literary history of Baghdād would amount to writing a history of Muslim science and literature. I shall, therefore, be brief in what I now say concerning the 'Abbāsides. Sedillot did not a whit exaggerate the truth when he said that from the very beginning an essentially scientific character was the marked feature of the school of Baghdād. To accept nothing as truth what was not borne out by experience and experiment was its cherished maxim. The literary history of the Muslims cannot be dismissed without a passing reference to that most singular society called "Ikhwānu-ṣ-Ṣafa." It consisted of forty members—a curious anticipation of the French Academy—and the transactions of this unique society have thrown a flood of light on the literary and scientific aims of the Muslims, and our thanks are due to Professor Dietrici for his indefatigable labour in unearthing its for-

[1] Guy Le Strange, *Baghdad under the Abbaside Caliphs*, p. 302.

gotton treatises. Professor Dietrici goes so far as to say that "the forebodings of even the Newtonian laws of gravitation are found among the Arabs."[1]

Al-Fārābī and Abū Bakr Ar-Rāzī must now engage our attention. Fārābī was born and educated in the town of Fārāb in Turkistan, which in later times was called Ortar. He had learnt, besides his mother-tongue, the Turkish, and some other languages. To Arabic alone he had not turned his attention when from his native land he repaired to Baghdād. On his arrival there he applied himself steadily to Arabic until he had mastered it. Then he began the study of philosophy by attending the lectures of Abū Bishr Malta on Aristotle. After he had done this for some time he went to Harrān, where he listened to the discourses of the Christian philosopher Abū Yūḥannā Ibn Khīlān. Then he returned to Baghdād and commenced to give lectures on philosophy, in the course of which he explained some of Aristotle's books. He was so persistent in his study that he read the book called De Anima two hundred times: a fact which he notes in his own copy of that celebrated work. Also he remarked in one: "I have read Aristotle's De Physica Auscultatione forty times, but I see that I must read it over many more times yet." Still when he was questioned as to who was the best philosopher—he or Aristotle—he answered, "If I had lived in his time I would have been his best disciple." Most of the writings by which he acquired his reputation, he wrote at Baghdād, where he remained until his opponents made it impossible for him to do so any longer. Then he went to Damascus and thence to Egypt. But he soon came

[1] *Die Naturanschaung der Araber*, p. 145.

back to Syria and joined the band of literary men who gathered round Saifu-d-Daulah at Aleppo. Great distinctions were conferred on him, and when Saifu-d-Daulah went to Damascus he followed him. He died in A. H. 339 (950 A.D.).[1]

Abū Bishr Malta Ibn Yūāus—the master of Fārābī in logic—a Christian and a native of Baghdād—held a high reputation as a logician and a teacher of that science. He died at Baghdād in the Caliphate of Ar-Rādhī, A. H. 322-329 (A.D. 934-941). He is the author of a commentary on the Isagoge of Porphory and a number of other works, the titles of which are given in Az-Zauzanī's Ṭabaqātu-l-Ḥukamā.[2]

Abū Bakr Ar-Rāzī was the physician of the Caliph Al-Muqtadir and was well-known in Europe till the 16th century. His treatise on smallpox and measles was published in London in 1848, with a carefully prepared translation and instructive notes by Dr. Greenhill.[3] He enjoyed also the patronage of the Sāmānide king Abū Sahib Manṣū Ibn Nūḥ, for whom he wrote his work, the Kitābu-l-Mansūrī. It is an abridged treatise on medicine, and contains valuable information both on the theory and practice of medicine.

Among Muslim scientists three names tower far above the rest : Ḥasan ibn Ḥusain, Abu-l-Wafā' and Ibn Yūnus.[4] They constitute a splendid triumvirate. Ḥasan was the first to introduce the geometry of position, which was quite recently perfected by Carnot, and other

[1] Wüstenfeld, Ærzte, pp. 53-4; Ibn Khall, Vol. III, p. 307.

[2] Ibn Khall, Vol. III, p. 310, note (1). *Cf.* Mas'udī Kitābu-t-Tanbīh, pp. 170 *et seq.*

[3] Ibn Khall., p. 304, note (7), Vol. III.

[4] Ibn Khall., Vol. III, p. 3, p. 320. Z. D. M. G., Vol. XIII, p. 633.

French geometricians. Abu-l-Wafā', the contemporary of Ḥasan, anticipated by centuries the discovery which is usually attributed to Tycho Brahe. Sedillot contends and proves that long before Tycho Brahe Abu-l-Wafā' detected the third inequality of the moon, which depends on the angular distance of the sun from the moon.[1] The third of this triumvirate, Ibn Yūnus, was the director of the observatory at Cairo, and the author of the great Ḥakamite Tables which were edited by Caussan.[2]

Scientific discoveries and philosophical speculations naturally evoked the spirit of free thinking which, as we have seen, even received direct encouragement from the Caliphs. But with the introduction of philosophic speculations the theologians, to meet the necessities of the times, had also to furbish up their weapons, and Ibn Khaldūn tells us that Ghazzālī and Fakhruu-d-Dīn ar-Rāzī were the first to use logic in theological discussions. Al-Ghazzālī, one of the most original thinkers of his age, lived in the days of Nidhāmu-l-Mulk and enjoyed his patronage and hospitality. A student of Avicenna's works, he almost rivalled the fame of his master. His work on "the revivification of the sciences of religion" is indeed most valuable. "It bears so remarkable a resemblance to the *Discours sur la mèthode* of Descartes, that had any translation of it existed in the days of Descartes, every one would have cried out against the plagiarism."[3]

To turn to Avicenna, who has set a deep mark on eastern and western thought alike. Some idea of his

[1] Chambers, *Descriptive Astronomy*, pp. 80-81.
[2] Hammer, Vol. I, p. 69.
[3] Lewes, *History of Philosophy*, Vol. II, p. 49.

influence can be formed by the fact that Scaliger considered the study of Avicenna as an indispensable preliminary to the study of medicine. He is the author of a treatise on philosophy entitled Ash Shifā' (the remedy) and the following well-known works: the Najāt (or preservative), the Ishārah (or indication), the Qānūn (canon medicini). Ibn Khallikān tells us that he has written other works as well "both short and long, amounting to nearly one hundred, besides epistles or short treatises on different subjects."[1] To fully estimate the influence of his philosophy would be impossible in this place and I, therefore, pass on. I have referred to the introduction of Aristotle among the Arabs. I must not omit to mention that they were not ignorant of Plato either. Al-Qifṭī, who has written "a dictionary of philosophers," mentions under Plato the translations of "the Republic," "the Laws" and "the Timœus." Under Socrates he cites passages from Crito and Phœdo.[2] The 'Abbāsides, as years rolled on, sank deeper and deeper in political insignificance, and Abu-l-Fidā' informs us that Aa-Rāḍhī Billāh was the last Caliph who composed poems of any worth, ascended the pulpit as an orator, moved in the society of learned men, and possessed a court and a treasury worthy of a prince.[3] It is a remarkable fact, however, that though the 'Abbāsides became mere puppets in the hands of their wazīrs, and countless dynasties rose and fell, sometimes acknowledging and sometimes actually defying the authority of the Commander of the Faithful, still "there was one thing common

[1] Ibn Khall., Vol. I, p. 443.
[2] Lewes, Vol. II, p. 34.
[3] Reiske's Edition, Vol. II, p. 14.

between all these founders of dynasties and wearers of the crown; it was the desire for promoting learning and encouraging the progress of letters.''[1] Under Asadu-d-Daulah, the great patron of scientists and literary men, lived the astronomer 'Abdur-r-Raḥmān Safy. Al-Manṣūr, the Sāmānide, and Saifu-d-Daulah, the Ḥamādanite, were the patrons of Fārābī. Niḍhāmu-l-Mulk the famous minister of Alp Arsalān and Malik Shāh, collected round him a brilliant company of learned men. Nūru-d-Dīn loved the society of the savants, and Saladin constantly had by his side Bahā'u-d-Dīn, Qāḍhī Al-Faḍhl and Imādu-d-Dīn, the Kātib. The courts of some of the princes were indeed the centre and hearth of learning. Libraries and colleges were established by a large number of them, and each strove to surpass the other in patronage of letters. Besides the private gathering of men of similar pursuits, like the gathering at Baṣrah under Wāṣil ibn 'Aṭā' and the yet more illustrious Ikhwānu-ṣ-Safā', the mosque was a great place for discussions and lectures of professors. Here it was that the professors lectured to a crowd of admiring students. In the mosque, be it noted, besides theology other branches of learning were also taught, for instance, literature, philology, philosophy, and even a certain amount of mathematics. "The Egyptian historians remark that under the reign of Al-'Aziz Nizār, public lectures on different branches of knowledge were opened in the mosque Al-Azhar at Old Cairo, and that the professors were paid by Government. Still earlier Ibn Hishām Al-Makhzumī caused regular lessons to be given in the great mosque at Damascus. At the time of Bilāl Ibn Abī Burdah, who

[1] The Islamic Libraries.

died A.H. 126, grammar was taught publicly in the mosques, and Sulamī, who died in A. H. 74, taught the readings of the Qur'ān in the mosque of Kūfah. We know moreover that the first school for Arabic literature was established by Ibn 'Abbās, and he himself gave regular lectures to an immense multitude who assembled in a valley near Mekka.''[1] But before long the particular educational institutions called the Madrasahs or Colleges arose. Von Kremer thinks that it was not the want of room in the mosques that called into being the Madrasahs, but the progress and diffusion of knowledge created a body of men who found it difficult to make a decent living through their abstract learning. It was to promote further study and to provide sufficient stipends for such men that the Madrasahs were really established. Later on we shall see the arrangements made by the Caliph Al-Ḥākim for this very purpose. It is difficult to lay down with any certainty who actually was the founder of the first Muslim academy, but it is agreed that before Niḍhāmu-l-Mulk such institutions did exist. It is maintained by some historians that the first institution of this kind was built in Baghdād in the year 383 A.H. (993 A.D.) ; another followed in the year 400 of the Hegira at Nishapur.[2] It was reckoned pious and meritorious to build Madrasahs and endow them with funds for the support of the professors and students, and it was not at all uncommon for both the professors and students to receive free quarters there. It is a singular fact, however, that until the time of Muṣtansir, when the dark cloud of the Mongul invasion was about to burst upon

[1] Ibn Khall., Introd., Vol. I, p. 30.

[2] Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Orients*, Vol. II, pp. 480-481.

Baghdād there was no Madrasah founded by any of the 'Abbāsid Caliphs. I shall not needlessly prolong this paper by enumerating the Madrasahs founded by Muslim princes and nobility. Sufficient it is to say that even women were not behind-hand in this respect, and history attributes the 'Academia Adhrāwiyyah' to the daughter of Nūru-d-Daulah and niece of Saladin, and the foundation of two academies at Damascus[1] to Settush-Sham. I hope you will forgive me however for giving some details of the two most famous of these academies, the Niḍhāmiyyah and the Mustanṣiriyyah of Baghdād. Niḍhāmu-l-Mulk, in A.H. 457 (A.D. 1065), founded the institution at Baghdād and another of the same name at Nishapur. They soon became the most important focuses of learning in that age and counted among their professors the theologian Ghazzālī and the historian Bahā'u-d-Dīn. The Niḍhāmiyyah was in good condition at the time of Yāqūt, and it seems that it stood "between the Bābu-l-Azaj and the Tigris bank, not very far from the Basaliyah gate of the town wall."[2] The Spanish traveller Ibn Jubair attended prayers in the Niḍhāmiyyah on the first day after his arrival in Baghdād. This was in the year 581 (A.D. 1185), and he describes it as the most splendid of the thirty and odd colleges which then adorned the city of East Baghdād. Ibn Jubair further reports that in his day the endowments derived from domains and rents belonging to the College amply sufficed both to pay the

[1] Wüstenfeld, *Die Academien der Araber*, pp. 51, 65.

[2] Guy Le Strange, *Baghdād under the Abbāsids*, pp. 297-300. Qazwīnī tells us that Niḍhāmu-l-Mulk used to spend one-tenth of his pay in building Colleges and Khankhahs.

stipends of the professors and to keep the building in good repair, besides supplying an extra fund for the support of poor scholars.

Ibn Baṭuṭah visited Baghdād in A.H. 727, after Baghdād had endured the Mongol siege, and found the Niḍhāmiyyah in good repair. Writing a dozen years later than Ibn Baṭuṭah, Ḥamd Allah, the Persian historian, briefly alludes to the Niḍhāmiyyah, which he calls "the mother of the Madrasahs, in Baghdād." This proves that down to the middle of the fourteenth century A.D. the College was still standing, though at the present time all vestiges of it have disappeared.

The Mustanṣiriyyah was established by the penultimate Caliph of the House of 'Abbās.[1] It was founded with the idea of overshadowing the glory of the Niḍhāmiyyah, which had been built nearly two centuries before: we are told that the magnificence of its architecture and the sumptuousness of its furniture made it without an equal. "It contained four separate law-schools, one for each of the orthodox sects of the *Sunnis*, with a professor at the head of each, who had seventy-five students (Faqīh) in his charge, to whom he gave instruction gratis. The four professors each received a monthly salary, and to each of the three hundred students one gold dinar was assigned. The great kitchen of the College further provided daily rations of bread and meat to all the inmates. According to Ibn Furāt there was a library in the Mustanṣiriyyah with rare books treating of the various sciences, so arranged that the students could easily consult them, and those who wished could copy these manuscripts, pens and paper being supplied by the establish-

[1] Guy Le Strange, *Baghdād under the Abbāsids*, pp. 267-269.

ment." Happily, like the Niḍhāmiyyah, this College also escaped the ravages of the Mongols, and both Ibn Baṭuṭah and Ḥamd Allah are loud in their praises of its magnificence. When Niebuhr visited Baghdād in 1750 he found that the ancient kitchen of the Mustanṣiriyyah College was still recognisable being used in his days as a weighing house; and Niebuhr copied here the inscription which gives the name and titles of the Caliph Mustanṣir with the statement that the Madrasah had been completed in the year 630 A.H. (1233 A.D.). So much for the Madrasahs.

The Fāṭimites and the Mamlūks of Egypt did not lag behind the 'Abbāsids in patronage of learning. In Ḥusnu-l-Muḥāḍharah of Suyūtī the reader will find valuable information concerning learning and learned men in Egypt. Al-Mu'izz and his three successors strenuously strove to promote and encourage learning. The Fāṭimites of Egypt at times rivalled the literary reputation of the 'Abbāsids, and Egypt might justly boast of names which would do honour even to Baghdād. I have already mentioned Ibn Yūnus. "His discoveries were continued by Ibnu-n-Nabdī who lived in Cairo in 1040 and by Ḥusain ibn Haitham, commonly called in Europe Al Hazan, who was famous for his discovery of atmospheric refraction. He was born in Spain, but resided chiefly in Egypt. Al-Ḥakim-Bi-Amrillah, the sixth of the Fāṭimites, founded the *Dāru-l-Hikmah,* which by the comprehensiveness of its scheme differed from every other school and Madrasah in the Islamic countries. It has been described at length elsewhere."[1]

[1] See "*The Islamic Libraries.*"

Before I pass on to the Spanish Musilms I shall rapidly go with you through the vast historical and geographical literature which Muslims have left us. Ḥajī Khalīfah mentions no less than 1,200 historical works, and doubtless there were many besides these which never came to the knowledge of the author of the Bibliographical Dictionary. Between Ibn Hisham, who flourished at the time of Manṣūr, and Ibn Khaldūn, who was a contemporary of Timūr, we have something like an apostolic succession. In Ibn Hisham we have the beginning; in Ibn Khaldūn, the triumph of historical development among the Muslims.

Ṭabarī was born in A.D. 839 at Amul in Ṭabaristān (whence his name Ṭabarī) and died at Baghdād in 923 A.D. His work extends over more than a dozen stout volumes and, thanks to European scholarship, we have it now in print. The annals are brought down to the tenth century, but his account of the last seventy years is brief and fragmentary. In the year 963, at the instance of the Sāmānid Prince, Manṣūr, Ibn Mohomed Dal'amī translated it into Persian. As far as the Persian history is concerned Ṭabarī follows *Khudai-nama* or Book of Lords (the original title of what was afterwards known as 'the Shāh Nāmah' or Book of Kings) "officially compiled under Chosroes I and afterwards carried down to A.D. 628, in the reign of Yazdajird III."[1] I

[1] Gibbon, Bury's Edition, Vol. V, p. 514. The following extract from Qifti's Tārikhu-l-Ḥukamā' is most interesting, pp. 110-111: "If you desire a complete and well-arranged history, then look to the history of Abu Ja'far at-Ṭabarī; for it is from the beginning of the world up to the year 309 [of the A.H.], but if you couple with this the history of Ahmed Ibn Abi Tahir and that of his son 'Ubaidullah you would do well, inasmuch as they have dealt exhaustively with the history of the 'Abbāsid Dynasty and have

have already mentioned that this book was translated into Arabic by Ibnu-l-Muqaffa' in the eighth century. It appears that Ṭabarī used neither the Pehlevi original nor the version of Ibnu-l-Muqaffa' "but a third work which was compiled from Ibnu-l-Muqaffa' and another version." For the period of the Caliphs Ṭabarī obviously had before him Ibn Isḥāq's books on the Muslim conquest and Wāqidī and a history of the Omayyads and the early 'Abbāsides by 'Alī Ibn Mohammed Al-Mas 'ūdī (A.D. 753-840). Then comes Bilādhurī, a most valu-

given many interesting details which do not find a place in Ṭabarī. They come down roughly to almost the same period, though Ṭabarī's history extends to a few more years. Next in point of time comes the history of Thābit, which covers some of the ground taken by Ṭabarī, but brings us down to a part of the year 363 A.H. If Thābit's history is read along with the history of Al-Farghānī, which is supplementary to that of Ṭabarī, the reader would do well, inasmuch as Al-Farghānī's history contains fuller details than Thābit's in certain places. Next comes the history of Hilāl Ibnu-l-Muḥsin Ibn Ibrāhām Aṣ-Ṣābī. It overlaps the period covered by the history of his (maternal) uncle Thābit and comes down to the year 447 of the A.H. No one has done for this period so much as has been done by Hilāl in the way of exhaustiveness, and in the examination of the movements silently working upon the different dynasties it treats of : as he has drawn the information concerning these events from his grandfather, who was Katib ul Insha', and hence conversant with the various events [that took place]. Hilāl himself was in charge of this department for some time and was thus assisted in writing his history by the information that passed through his department.

This history is followed by that of his son Gharsu-n-Ni'mah, Muhammed Ibn Hilāl, which is an excellent work and extends a little beyond the year 470 A.H. The latter part of the work, for some reason or other, does not come up to the level of the earlier portion. Then comes Ibn Hamadāni, whose history overlaps that of Ibn Hilāl and concludes with a part of the year 512 (A.H.). This was supplemented by Abul Hasan ibn ur Rāghūnī, whose work, however, is very unsatisfactory, since history was no part of his genius. It embraces the period up to the year 527. Then follows the supplement of Al'Afit Sadaqah-al Haddad, which comes down to a little more than the year 570 A.H. Then comes al Jauzi, whose history brings us a little later than 580 A.H. Finally comes the supplement of Ibnu-l-Qādisī, which concludes with the year 616."

able authority for the military history of the Saracens. He lived at Baghdād in the ninth century. A contemporary of Bilādhurī, Ibn Qutaibah, is the author of the Kitābu-l-Ma'ārif. It is a small work, but contains very valuable information on the early Arabs and the Persians. 'Abdul-l-Ḥakam, also a contemporary of Bilādhurī, is the author of a book concerning the conquests in Egypt and Africa. He died in Egypt, 871 A.D. Far greater than any of these is Mas'ūdī. He was born in A.D. 900 and died in 956. He wrote an encyclopædic work on the history of the past which he reduced into a shorter compass, but even this was immense; then he made a further abstract of it under the title of "The Golden Meadows," which happily has come down to us. This work attests the largeness of his historical vision, which takes in, within its compass, not merely military history, but also literature, religion and culture in general. Later authors like Almakin, Abu-l-Fidā and Ibnu-l-Athīr, have made free use of Ṭabarī and copied him wholesale. In Ibn Khaldūn we have history written almost in modern style and on modern principles. His 'Prolegomena' is undoubtedly a remarkable work of its kind. It would be impossible to convey an adequate idea of this work in a short space. Suffice it to say that his definition of history, its object and its scope, his treatment of the external conditions which act and react upon national life, his observations on the civilization of the Arabs, in fine, his whole method of treatment, curiously anticipates the modern conception of the Science of History.

To turn to the geography of the Arabs. I do not for a moment maintain that their geographical notions

were entirely accurate. In fact far from it, but I only wish to bring home to you the fact that they did not suffer geography to be neglected. Ibn Khurdadhbeh wrote the first geographical work, as far as the present writer is aware. He was followed by Qudāmah who compiled a comprehensive and practical handbook of geography for the use of the central chancery of Baghdād. It dealt minutely with the provinces of the empire, the organisation of the postal service and the sub-divisions of the provinces. According to Von Kremer his geographical knowledge was fairly sound. He was aware of the globular form of the earth and the shortness of the days at the poles. But beside Muqaddasī, who wrote in the year 375 A.H. (985-6 A.D.), all the other Muslim geographers sink into insignificance. His work is a veritable encyclopædia, and it is with justice that the author says that "my book consists of three parts, of which the first embraces that which I have myself seen, the second what I have heard from reliable persons, and the third what I have read in books." Yāqūt and Abu-l-Fidā' are but learned and laborious compilers.[1]

Before parting with you I shall cast a hurried glance at Muslim Spain. Spain was won for the Muslims between A.D. 710 and 712, and ruled by a series of governors appointed by the Omayyads of Damascus. On the fall of the Caliphate of Damascus, one of the few surviving members of the Omayyad Dynasty was 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān, a grandson of Hisham, the tenth Omayyad Caliph. To Spain, torn by rivalry and factions of the Berbers and the Arabs, he offered himself as king. Towards the end of the year 755 A.D., he landed in Andalusia

[1] Von Kremer, Vol. II, p. 433.

and by the following year he received the homage of Mohammedan Spain. For two centuries and a half his successors held their position against discontent, factions and the encroachment of the Christians of the north. Until 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān III, who adopted the title of Caliph in 229 A.H., they were satisfied with the humbler titles of Amī and Sulṭān. This 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān III was the most vigorous of that line of sovereigns. He not only kept in check the Christian King of Leon, Castile and Navarre, but also protected Spain from dangers from Africa. After him no name like his adorns the history of Spain. But credit is due to the famous minister Al-Manṣūr, who kept together for a time the unity of the kingdom. In the early part of the eleventh century Spain became the theatre of most wild scenes. Factions made headway and adventurers arose to divide the spoil. A number of petty dynasties came into being, which are known in Spanish history as the *Reyes de Taifas* or party kings. Among these, history honourably mentions the cultured house of the 'Abbāsides of Seville, who championed the cause of Islam until the Almoravides appeared on the stage.

In Art, Literature and Science the Caliphate of Cordova rivalled, if it did not outshine, the glory of Baghdād. Grammar and rhetoric were cultivated by the Spanish Muslims to perfection. "So great is the ardour of the Andalusians in the cultivation of these two sciences," says the Spanish Ibn Sa'īd, "and so vast their attainments, that I do not hesitate to say that there are at present, in this country, authors equal in merit and parts to the most famous grammarians and rhetori-

cians in the times of Khalīl and Sībawah."[1] In medicine the Spanish Arabs made remarkable progress. I shall mention to you the names of Yaḥyā Ibn Isḥāq, Alkatani, Zahravi and Ibn Zuhr. Ibn Zuhr is the author of the Kitābu-t-Taisīr (a manual on medicine and the art of preserving health). This is the very work which Dr. Paravaci, assisted by a Jewish physician named Jacob, translated into Latin (A.D. 1281) from an intermediate Hebrew translation, for the use of John Dandolo, Doge of Venice. It went through several editions in Europe.[2] Zahravi's work on surgery is still extant, and I am proud to tell you that our Public Library in this city possesses an excellent copy of it. Yaḥyā lived under 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān III, who appointed him his wazīr. He wrote an excellent book on the simples used in medicine.[3]

The reign of Hakam II was indeed the Augustan age of Arabian learning in Spain. The Caliph was passionately devoted to letters. His agents were sent to all parts of the East to collect rare books and, being so fond of books, it is not to be wondered at if he gathered an extraordinarily good collection. Ibn-u-l-Abbār says that the unfinished catalogue of his library counted forty volumes.[4] Moreover it was under Hakam II that the study of philosophy was commenced and cultivated.[5] Among the Muslim philosophers of Spain Avempace and Averroes occupy the first and foremost place. Besides the honour of having Averroes for his pupil, it is said of

[1] Maqqarī, *Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain*, Vol. I, p. 142.
[2] Maqqarī, Vol. I, Appendix, p. vii, note 20.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 464, note (132).
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 418.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. xiii, appendix.

Avempace by some Arab writers that " if we establish a comparison between his essays and those of Ibn Sīnā or Al-Ghazzālī, the two authors who most promoted the study of philosophy in the East after Al-Fārābī, we shall find the balance inclining rather on the side of Ibn Bājah or Avempace, especially if we bear in mind the clearness and beauty of his expressions and his aptitude in grasping the writings of Aristotle." Ibn Rushd, or Averroes, was a native of Cordova, where he spent the first years of his life. He made a thorough study of medicine, philosophy and jurisprudence and won great distinction. He was appointed Qāḍhī at first of Seville, and then of Cordova. Al-Manṣūr to start with showed himself very favourably disposed towards him, but afterwards Averroes, incurring his displeasure by the study of philosophy, was exiled to Alislah, a town close to Cordova. The exile, however, was of short duration, for he was recalled in A.D. 1198-9. Ibn Rushd died at Morocco in the beginning of A.H. 595.

The most striking feature in the civilization of Muslim Spain is the high culture of the women. The examples of such women, let us hope, will set an ideal for our own women to imitate and live up to. I shall only mention a few : Wallādah, the daughter of Al-Mustakfī of Cordova, was considered the Arabian Sappho. She devoted herself exclusively to the study of rhetoric and poetry. 'Ayishah, the daughter of Prince Aḥmad of Cordova, was distinguished for her rare genius. Her orations were frequently read in the royal academy at Cordova and gained the greatest applause. She died in the year 400 of the Hegira. She left behind numerous monuments of her genius in the form of literary

productions together with a very extensive and well-selected library. Labana, also a native of Cordova, was not only a poetess, but also deeply read in philosophy. She held an office, not often enjoyed by women, that of the Private Secretary to the Caliph Al-Ḥakam. Mariam, the daughter of Ya'qūb Al-Anṣārī, a native of Seville, was a highly accomplished woman. She taught rhetoric, poetry and literature.

The fact that Spain in the heyday of Muslim power could boast of seventy public libraries abundantly and conclusively proves that culture was not merely confined to the higher classes but was general among the people. It remains now for me to say a few words concerning the influence of Muslim learning on European thought. The channels through which Muslim learning was chiefly communicated to Europe were the Crusades, the Spanish Jews, and the Arabs of Sicily and Africa. That remarkable movement which in the eleventh century stirred Europe to its depth brought in its train consequences wholly beyond the contemplation or calculation of its authors. Though the Crusades eventually failed to win back from the Muslims the cradle of the Christian faith and the land of its Apostles, still it was the Crusades that brought the East and West, for the first time, into close contact. The gulf which had hitherto divided the Easterns and the Westerns was bridged over, and Europe was permitted henceforth to participate in the refined and ripened culture of the East. Far more important than the Crusades was the friendly relation which subsisted between Muslim Spain and Christian countries : a relation doubtless the outcome of the tolerant policy of the Omayyads of Cordova. Spain, with its academies at Cordova,

Seville, Granada, Toledo, Xativa, Valentia and Almeria, was the most important seat of learning during the Middle Ages, and thither students flocked from all parts of the world. The Jews, who had been most mercilessly ill-treated under the Visigoths, found a safe asylum and ample opportunities for the cultivation of learning under the Muslims. And indeed, if the Muslims have names like Ibn Zuhr, Avempace, Ibn Ṭufail and Averroes to show, the Jews likewise can point to Aben Esra, Jonah Ben Gannach, Maimonides, Bechai, and David Químchi. These Jews, spreading over the different countries became the real carriers of Muslim civilization to Christian Europe.

Cæsar of Heisterbach speaks of young men who went to study astrology at Toledo; and it appears, says Jourdain, that in his time astronomy was not distinguished from astrology.[1] Alvarus of Cordova bitterly complains of the leaning of the Christian *savants* towards the language and literature of the Saracens, and Hugh of Saint-Victor reproaches the Bishop of Seville, in a letter, for his zeal in studying the pagan philosophy, meaning thereby Muslim learning. Omitting Gerbert, the reports of whose travels among Muslims are open to serious doubts, Constantine the African is incontestably superior to his contemporaries, says Renan because he had received a Muslim education. Roger Bacon eagerly studies Averroes, and from 1130 to 1150 translations of Arabic books were made at Toledo under the patronage of Archbishop Raymond.[1] Then again the protection and patronage accorded to letters and philosophy by Frederick II

[1] Jourdain, Recherches sur l'age et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote, p. 95.

and his successors brought the works of Arab philosophers into vogue. Sicily was taken by the Aghlabides in the ninth century, and from there likewise Muslim learning made its way among the Christians. The geographer Idrīsī lived at the court of Roger of Sicily, and made for his use a silver globe with the names of the countries then known engraved in Arabic.[1] By far the greatest influence of Muslim learning was exerted on European thought through the medium of the Arabic translation of Aristotle, when it was triumphantly enthroned in the University of Paris in the first year of the thirteenth century: Aristotle publicly, says Michelet, secretly the Arabs and the Jews with the pantheism of Averroes and the subtleties of Cabala.[2]

The whole situation has been splendidly summed up by Lecky, who says :—" Not till the education of Europe passed from the monasteries to the universities, not till Mohammedan science and classical forethought and industrial independence broke the sceptre of the Church did the intellectual revival of Europe begin."[3]

1 Gregorovius, *Rome in the Middle Ages*, Vol. V, Part II, pp. 619-620; also note (2).

2 Mill, *Dissertations and Discussions*, Vol. II, p. 168.

3 Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, Vol. II, p. 206.

IBN-ḤAZM'S JAMHARATU-N-NASAB

Ibn Ḥazm (circa 994-1054). His ancestor Yazīd was a mawla to Yazīd Ibn Abī Sufyān Sakhr Ibn Harb Ibn Omayya Ibn 'Abd Shams, the Omayyad, and the first of the family who embraced Islam. (Ibn Khall.' Vol. II, p. 267). He had at first been a follower of the Shāfi'ite sect but later abandoned it for that of the Dhāhirites. (The sect of the Dhāhirites or Exteriorists was founded by Dā'ūd Ibn 'Alī Al-Iṣfahānī (see Macdonald, Develop. of Muslim Theology, p. 108.) They were so called because they understood the words of the Qur'ān in their plain literal sense, and rejected the ta'wil, or allegorical interpretation to which other sects have recourse in certain cases. They differed completely from the Hanafite sect in rejecting the Qiyās. See Ibn Khall., Vol. II, p. 272 note (2).

Von Kremer says (Gesch. der herrsch. Ideen des Islams, p. 124) that Ibn Ḥazm was of Christian origin and his father was a wazir under the dynasty of the 'Amīrīdes. He himself, as a zealous supporter of the Omayyads, played a distinguished political rôle and became the great vazir of 'Abdu-r-Raḥmān V. He has written several famous works; among others a history of the Omayyads under the title of Nuqṭaṭu-l-'Arūs; Al-Milal wa-n Niḥal which deals with religious and philosophic sects and religions generally, a copy of which will be found in the Vienna library and Jamhartu-n-Nasab. Dozy, in his introduction to Adhári's Al-Bayā-

nu-l-Mughrib, says : "Ibn Hazm......écrivit un ouvrage généalogique intitulé Djamharato 'l-ansāb, qui, à en juger par plusieurs fragments qui se trouvent surtout chez Ibno-'l-Abbár, contenait des renseignements historiques importants. De ces deux ouvrages (Al Milal wa-n Niḥal and Jamharatu-n-Nasab), nous ne possédons que des extraits précieux, qui en font regretter vivement la perte," p. 67.

There is a splendid MS. however, of "Jamharatu-n-Nasab," in Khuda Bukhsh's Oriental Public Library, Bankipur. This MS. does not tell us when it was copied, but on the fly-leaf the year 785 A.H. is given as the date when this MS. passed into the possession of one Syed 'Ali Ibn Syed Mahdī who claims descent from Idrīs, the ruler of Fās (Fez).

On another folio there is a small passage which apparently purports to be the settlement of an account of the owner of the MS. This is important inasmuch as it bears the date of the settlement, *viz.*, Tuesday, the 2nd of Sh'abān 978 A.H.

On the third folio occurs a passage which suggests that this MS. was in existence as early as 653 of the A.H. The passage runs thus :—

الحمد لله توفي المقدم الفقيه محمد بن علي بن علوي ليلة الاحد
سلخ شهر ذى الحجة الحرام سنة ٦٥٣ قلت و هو الفقيه الشريف الصالح
المولى العالم القطب محمد بن علي بن محمد صاحب مرباط بن علي
خالع قسم بن علوي بن محمد بن علوي بن عبيد الله بن احمد بن
عيسى بن محمد بن علي بن جعفر الصادق بن محمد الباقر بن
زين العابدين علي ابن الحسين السبط بن امير المومنين علي بن
ابي طالب بن عبد المطلب ابن هاشم بن عبد مناف -

On folio 6 Ibn Ḥazm thus describes the scope of Jamharatu-n-Nasab :

فجمعنا في كتابنا هذا تواشج ارحام قبائل العرب و تفرع بعضها من بعض و ذكرا من اعيان كل قبيلة مقداراً يكون من وقف عليه خارجا من الجهل با لانساب و مشرفاً على جمهرتها و بالله تعالى التوفيق و بدانا بولد عدنان لانهم الصريح من ولد اسمعيل الذبيح بن ابراهيم الخليل رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و لان محمدا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم سيد ولد آدم عليه السلام من عدنان و ابتدانا من ولد عدنان بقريش لروضعه عليه السلام منهم و ابتدانا من قريش بالاقرب فالاقرب منه عليه السلام ثم الاقرب فالاقرب من قريش وابتدانا من ولد قحطان بالانصار رضي الله عنهم لانهم اولى الناس بذلك لتقديم الله تعالى اياهم فى الفضل و لما اظهر الله عز وجل بايديهم من الدين و اوجب لهم بذلك حقا على كل مسلم ثم الاقرب فالاقرب من الانصار و بالله التوفيق لا رب غيره -

On folio 7 he writes :—

شرطنا ان لا نذكر من ولادات اوائل القبائل و اوساطه (؟) لا من انسل و اما من انقرض نسله فلا معني لذكره الا من كان من الصحابة رضي الله عنهم و انبائهم و اهل الشرف و نباهة الذكر فلابد من ذكرهم او يدعو سبب الى ذكر من انقرض عقبه لشهرته او لبعض الامرون انقرضت اعقابهم -

From the following passage we shall get an idea as to how Ibn Ḥazm deals with his subject. It begins on folio 140.

و هولاء ولد اخيه عُفَيّر بن عدي بن الحرث - ولد عفير بن عدي ابن الحرث نور بن عفير و هو كندة - و هولاء بنو كندة و هو نور بن عفير بن عدي بن الحرث - ولد كندة بن عفير معوية بن كندة و اشرس بن كندة امهما رملة بنت اسد بن ربيعة بن نزار و من بطون

كندة معوية و وهب و بدا و الرائش بطون كبار و هم بنو الحرث بن
معوية بن ثور بن مرتع و هو عمرو ابن معاوية بن كندة فمن بني
الرائش بن معوية هذا ثور بن مرتع و هو عمرو ابن معارية بن كندة
فمن بني الرائش بن معوية هذا القاضي ابو امية شريح ابن الحرث بن
قيس بن الجهم بن معاوية بن الرائش بن الحارث بن معوية كان له
ابن اسمه عبد الله وله ابن اسمه ميسرة وله عقب - من ولده علي
بن عبد الله ابن معاوية بن ميسرة بن شريح القاضي المذكور
محدث كوفي روي عنه وكيع ابن الجراح و ابن اخي شريح ابو المنازل
عثمن بن عبيد الله بن الحرث ولي قضاء خراسان و من بني معوية
بن الحرث بن معوية الاشعث بن قيس بن معدي كرب بن معوية
بن جبلة بن عدي بن ربيعة بن معوية بن الحرث ابن معوية بن كندة
و ابنه محمد بن الاشعث و ابنه عبد الرحمن بن محمد القائم علي
عبد الملك و الحجاج و منهم سعيد بن عمرو بن سهل بن اسحق ابن
محمد بن الاشعث بن قيس محدث لقي سفين بن عيينة و منهم
الفيلسوف يعقوب بن اسحق بن الصباح بن عمران بن اسمعيل بن
الاشعث ابن قيس ولي ابوه الكوفة و ليعقوب اخ اسمه الصباح بن
اسحق مات في حيوة [ابيه] و كان اسحق شاعراً مرجئا متكلما وله
حديث - اسرت الاشعث في الجاهلية بنو الحرث بن كعب فافتدي
بثلاثة الاف بعير وبنوه بالكوفة - و اسحق الاعرج بن ابراهيم بن
قيس بن حجر بن معدي كرب وفد ابوه الى النبي صلى الله عليه
و سلم و كان اسحق هذا عالماً بالنسب و سيف ابن قيس اخو الاشعث
جعله رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم مؤذن قومه فلم يزل مؤذنهم
حتى مات و شرحبيل بن السمط بن الاسود بن جبلة بن عدي بن
ربيعة بن معوية بن الحرث بن معوية بن ثور بن مرتع بن معوية ابن
كندة له صحبة ولي حمص ومن ولده السمط بن يزيد بن شرحبيل
ابن السمط صلبه مروان بن محمد و حجر بن عدي و هو الادبر بن جبلة

ابن عدي بن ربيعة له صحبة و قتله معوية صبرا و ابناه عبد الله [1] و
عبد الرحمن ابنا حجر قتلهما المصعب بن الزبير و كانوا يتشيعون و شريح
ابن المكدد بن مرة بن سلمة بن مرة بن حجر بن عدي بن ربيعة بن
معوية له صحبة - و ابن عمه لحا حجر السوء [2] بن يزيد بن سلمة بن
مرة ولاه معوية ارمينية و ابن عمهم عائذ بن عدي بن همام بن مرة بن
حجر لطم عبد الرحمن بن محمد بن الاشعث فلم تغضب له كندة و
غضبت له همدان و بنو الارقم بن النعمن بن عمرو بن وهب بن ربيعة
بن معوية بن الحرث ابن معوية بن ثور بن مرتع بن معوية بن كندة
كانوا عثمانيين رحلو عن الكوفة الى معوية و قالوا لا نقيم ببلد يُسَبُّ
فيه عثمن فانزلهم معوية بالرها و منهم الفقيه عدي بن عدي بن
عميرة بن فروة بن زرارة بن الارقم بن النعمن ولي ارمينية و اذربيجان
لسليمن بن عبد الملك و بنو شجرة بن معوية بن ربيعة بن وهب بن
ربيعة بن معوية بن الحرث بن معوية بن ثور بن مرتع بن معوية بن
كندة و هم بحضرموت - و المحدث اجلح و اسمه يحيي بن عبد الله بن
معوية بن حسان و ابنه عبد الله بن الاجلح و العباس بن زيد بن الاسود
بن سلمة بن حجر بن [2] وهب بن ربيعة بن معوية ابن الحرث بن
معوية بن ثور بن مرتع وفد ابوه و جده على النبي صلى الله عليه
و سلم - و ابنه عبيد الله بن العباس [ولي] فارس لخلد بن عبد
الله القسري و الكوفة ليوسف بن عمر و الشرطة لعبد الله بن عمر بن
عبد العزيز و قنسرين للسفاح و ارمينية للمنصور و بها مات قتلت
الخوارج اخاه جعفر بن العباس و سعيد بن الاسود بن جبلة بن سعد
بن الاسود بن سلمة بن حجر قال لمعوية يوم بايعه بالنخيلة انا
ابايعك على كتاب الله عز و جل و سنة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم
فقال له معوية لا شرط لك فقال هو لمعوية و انت لا بيعة لك - و ابو

1 Cf. Ibn Duraid, p. 218, where he is called 'Ubaidu-llah. In the footnote it is stated that in the Genealogy of Abu 'Ubaid he is called 'Abdu-llah.

2 In Ibn Duraid, Ḥujru-sh-Sharr, p. 214.

العمرطة عمير بن يزيد بن عمرو بن شراحيل بن النعمن بن المنذر بن
ملك بن الحرث بن معوية بن الحرث بن معوية بن ثور بن مرتع
شيعي قاتل مع حجر بن عدي و ولي ابنه الحسين بن ابي العمرطة
شرطة الحجاج و ولي ايضا ماوراء النهر للجراح بن عبد الله الحكمي و
عبد الله بن الحزب واسم الحزب سلمة بن مسعود بن خلد بن اصرم
و هو من بني الطمح بن الحزب بن معوية بن الحرث بن معوية بن
ثور بن مرتع واليه تنسب الحزبية من الروافض و كان غاليا كافرا اوجب
على اصحابه سبع عشرة صلوة كل يوم و ليلة في كل صلوة خمس عشرة
ركعة ثم تاب باختياره و رجع الى قول الصفرية و بريء اصحابه منه لما
تاب و بقوا على كفرهم - والملك الحرث بن عمرو المقصور و هو ابن حجر
آكل المرار بن عمرو بن معوية بن الحرث بن معوية بن ثور بن مرتع
و حجر بن الحرث الملك المذكور والد امرئ القيس الشاعر و كان ملكا
على بني كنانة و بني اسد ابني خزيمة فقتلته بنو اسد و اخوته
شرحبيل بن الحرث ملك بني تميم و ضبة و الرباب قتله اخوه
يوم الكلاب - و سلمة بن الحرث ملك بكر و تغلب ابني وائل - و
معدي كرب ملك قيس عيلان - و قيس بن الحرث [1] كان سيارا
فاي قوم نزل بهم فهو ملكهم - و حسان بن عمرو بن الجون - و اسمه
معوية بن حجر آكل المرار كان على تميم يوم جبلة و كان ابن عمه
معوية بن شراحيل بن اخضر بن الجون مع بني عامر يوم جبلة ايضا -
و الحرث الولادة اخو حجر آكل المرار من ولده حجر الفرد و عبد الله
ابنا الحرث له عقب كثير يعرفون ببني الشيطان فقال لهم رسول الله
صلى الله عليه و سلم انتم بنو عبد الله - منهم السائب بن يزيد بن سعيد
بن ثمامة بن الاسود بن عبد الله بن الحرث الولادة وهو حليف لبني
عبد شمس و هو يعرفه المحدثون السائب ابن اخت نمر - منهم الخارجي
باليمن المعروف بطالب الحق و هو عبد الله بن يحيي بن عمرو بن
شرحبيل بن عمرو بن الاسود بن عبد الله بن الحرث الولادة - و كان

[1] *Cf.* Ibn Duraid, p. 220.

هذا الخارجي اعور تسمى بالخلافة و مسكنه حضرموت باليمن و كان اباضيا و كان ابرهة و صاحبه ابو حمزة صاحب المدينة و يوم قديد كلاهما من قواد عبد الله ابن يحيى هذا - و من بني حجر الفرد بن الحرث الولادة الملوك الاربعة مخوس و مشرح و جمد و ابضعة كلهم بالاسكان [1] و اختهم العمردته بنو معدي كرب ابن وليعة بن شرحبيل بن معوية بن حجر الفرد وفدوا الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ثم ارتدوا فقتلوا كلهم - و ابن اخيهم كثير بن الصلت بن معدي كرب ابن وليعة سكن المدينة و كان لحجر آكل المرار و للحرث الولادة اخ ثالث اسمه امرؤ القيس بن عمرو و من ولده كان الرجل الصالح امرء القيس بن عابس ابن المنذر بن امرئ القيس المذكور له صحبة و ثبت على الاسلام ايام الردة و كان شديداً على من ارتد و بدر الى عمه فقتله فلما راى السيف قال له اتقتل عمك فقال انت عمى و الله ربي و رجاء بن حيوة بن جندل [1] بن الاحنف ابن السمط بن امرئ القيس المذكور - مضى بنو معوية بن كندة [1]

The following extracts from Ibn Ḥazm contain so many important, and hitherto unknown, things that I cannot refrain from giving them *in extenso*.

و هولاء بنو عدي بن كعب - ولد عدي بن كعب رزاح بفتح الراء و الزاي و عويج فولد رزاح قرط بن رزاح فولد قرط عبد الله فولد عبد الله بن قرط رباح و تميم و صراد فمن ولد صراد الشفاء بنت عبد الله بن عبد شمس بن حلف بن صراد بن عبد الله استعملها عمر على السوق و من ولد تميم بن عبد الله بن قرط ابوبكر بن محمد بن عبد الله بن عمرو بن المؤمل بن حبيب بن تميم ابن عبد الله كان يري راى الخوارج الاباضية و كان مع ابي حمزة يوم قديد و بالمدينة فولد ابوبكر هذا عمرو و عمر ولي عمر قضاء الادن و ولى عمرو قضاء دمشق للرشيد و امه رقية بنت يعقوب بن سعيد بن نوفل بن الحرث بن عبد المطلب و محمد بن

1 In Ibn Duraid, Khanzat, p. 221.

المؤمل بن احمد بن الحرث بن عمرو بن عبد الله بن عمرو بن الحرث
بن عمرو بن المؤمل بن حبيب ابن تميم بن عبد الله بن قرط محدث
شامل سكن مكة و بها مات سنة تسع عشرة و ثلثمائة و هو ثقة عالم
بالنحو واسع الرواية - و ولد رباح بن عبد الله ابن قرط آذاة و عبد العزي
فولد اذاة قيلة و هي ام ابن ابي قحافة والد ابي بكر الصديق وانس
بن اذاة فمن ولد انس عمر و عبد الله ابنا سراقة بن المعتمر بن انس بن
اذاة شهد بدراً مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لا عقب لعمر و بقى
لعبد الله عقب من قبل ابن ابنه عثمن بن عبد الله بن عبد الله و كان
عثمن هذا على بنت عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن زيد بن الخطاب من
فاطمة بنت عمر بن الخطاب فعقبه كله منها - و لعثمن هذا ابن اسمه
الزبير قتل يوم قديد و ولد عبد العزي بن رياح نفيل فولد نفيل عمرو
و الخطاب فولد عمرو زيد رفض الاوثان في الجاهلية وامتنع من اكل
ماذبح لغير الله عز و جل و التزم الحنيفية و دين ابراهيم عليه السلام
الى ان قتلته اهل ميفعة قرية من قرى البلقاء بقرب دمشق من لخم
او جذام في الجاهلية رحمه الله و اخبر رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم
انه يبعث يوم القيمة وحده فولد زيد سعيد احد العشرة و عاتكة تزوجها
عبد الله بن ابي بكر ثم عمر بن الخطاب ثم الزبير بن العوام كلهم قتل
عنها فولد سعيد هشام و عبد الرحمن الاكبر و عبد الرحمن الاصغر كانت
ام عبد الرحمن الاكبر ام جميل بنت الخطاب اخت عمر من المهاجرات
اسلمت قبل عمر رضي الله عنهم و كان عمر يعذبها على الاسلام و عبد
الرحمن هذا هو القائل و كان شاعراً في يوم الحرة

فان تقتلونا يوم حرة واقم * فنحن على الاسلام اول من قتل
و نحن قتلناكم ببدر اذلة * و أبنا باسلاب لنا منهم نفل
فان ينج منا عائذ البيت سالما * فكل الذي قد نالنا منكم جلل

اي صغير و هو من الاضداد يعني عبد الله بن الزبير رضي الله عنه ولا
عقب لعبد الرحمن هذا و من ولده نفيل بن هشام بن سعيد بن زيد
روي عنه و عقبه قليل هكذا قال من يوثق بعلمه و ذكر بعض الناس

ان له بصنعاء اليمن عقبا كثيرا - و ولد الخطاب عمر امير المؤمنين و زيد
رضي الله عنهما كلاهما من المهاجرين الاولين بدريان قتل زيد يوم
اليمامة - و اميمة ولدت لسعيد بن زيد بن عمرو بن نفيل من المهاجرات
الاول اسلمت قبل عمر - و صفية ولدت الاسود بن سفين بن عبد الاسد
المخزومي و اخوته - فولد زيد بن الخطاب عبد الرحمن ولي مكة فولد
عبد الرحمن بن زيد عبد الحميد ولي الكوفة لعمر ابن عبد العزيز - وامه
من بني البكاء من بني عامر - و عبد الله امه فاطمة بنت عمر بن
الخطاب - و عبد العزيز شقيق عبد الحميد - و عبد الملك لام ولد
و ابراهيم و محمد و ابوبكر و عمر امه معقبة و اسيد كانت ام محمد و
ابى بكر و ابراهيم و اسيد سودة بنت عبد الله بن عمر بن الخطاب - ثم
خلف عليها بعد عبد الرحمن بن زيد عروة بن الزبير فولدت له ابنة
اسمها اسماء و كان عبد الرحمن تزوجها بعد عمتها فاطمة بنت عمر - فولد
عبد الحميد عمر ولي مكة للسفاح و ولي اليمن لداود بن على خمسة
اشهر و كان غاية في الفضل - و عبد الكبير ولي ارمينية لموسى
الهادي - و عبد الرحمن فولد عبد الحكيم سعيد و ولد عبد الرحمن بن
عبد الحميد بن عبد الرحمن بن زيد بن الخطاب زيد بن عبد الرحمن و
عبد الحميد فولد زيد عمر بن زيد فولد عمر عبد الله محدث روي عنه
تقي بن مخلد - و ابن عمه عبد الله بن عمر بن عبد الحميد بن
عبد الرحمن بن عبد الحميد بن عبد الرحمن بن زيد بن الخطاب
محدث ايضا - و من ولد اسيد بن عبد الرحمن بن زيد بن الخطاب
عمر بن اسيد ابن عبد الرحمن بن زيد قتل يوم قديد و عبد الرحمن بن
اسيد فولد عبد الرحمن بن اسيد عمر محدث روى عنه ابو نعيم -
و ولد امير المؤمنين عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه حفصة ام المؤمنين
و رقية و زينب تزوجها عبد الرحمن بن معمر بن عبد الله بن ابى بن
سلول و من الذكور عشرة عبد الله الاكبر الصاحب الفاضل شقيق حفصة
امهما بنت مظعون اخت عثمن و قدامة ابني مظعون و عاصم امه جميلة
بنت عاصم بن ثابت بن ابي بن الاقلح الانصاري حمي الدبر - و

عبيد الله قتل يوم صفين مع معوية امه خزاعية فرق الاسلام بينهما و
بين عمر - و عبد الرحمن الاصغر امه و ام اخته زينب [ام] ولد لكل
هولاء عقب - و عبد الله الاصغر و عبد الرحمن الاكبر و عبد الرحمن الاوسط
و عياض امه عاتكة بنت زيد بن عمرو بن نفيل - و زيد الاكبر و رقية
امهما ام كلثوم بنت علي ابن ابي طالب من فاطمة بنت رسول الله
صلى الله عليه و سلم و زيد الاصغر لاعقب لواحد منهم - فولد عبد الله
بن عمر عبد الله و فيه العدد و عبيد الله و عبد الرحمن و ابوبكر و عمر
و عثمن و ابو عبيدة و زيد و واقد و بلال و سالم الفقيه و ابو عبيد و
حمزة امهم كلهم زيد بن عبد الله سكن الكوفة - فولد عبد الله بن
عبد الله بن عمر عبد الله و عبد العزيز و عبد الحميد و عبد الرحمن و
ابراهيم و عمر امه ام سلمة بنت المختار بن ابي عبيد - فولد
عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن عبد الله بن عمر بن الخطاب عمر بن
عبد الرحمن صحب الرشيد و ابابكر بن عبد الرحمن من اهل العلم و
يحيى بن عبد الرحمن سكن الجند من ارض اليمن و اتخذ بها ضياعا
فولده هناك - و ولد عبد العزيز بن عبد الله ابن عبد الله بن عمر
عبد الله الناسك الفاضل امه امة الحميد بنت عبد الله بن عياض بن
عمرو بن بلال بن بلبل بن احيحة بن الجلاح الاوسي - و عبد الحميد
و اسحق و محمد و ابوبكر و عمر ولي كرمان و المدينة للهادي و عليه
قام الحسين بن علي بن الحسن بن الحسين بن علي بن ابي طالب
المقتول بفخ فولد محمد بن عبد العزيز عبد الله كان ولده بطرسوس
سكانا و عيسى سكن دمشق - و ولد عبد الله الناسك بن عبد العزيز
بن عبد الله ابن عبد الله بن عمر عبد الرحمن و عبد العزيز و عبد الحميد
ولي عبد الرحمن قضاء المدينة ثم امرتها للمامون - و لعبد الله
الناسك عقب الى الان - و من ولده كان ابو عبد الرحمن عبد الله
بن عبد الحميد بن الناسك عبد الله بن عبد العزيز بن عبد الله
بن عبد الله بن عمر بن الخطاب القائم بالصعيد على احمد بن طولون
قتل هناك رحمه الله - و من ولده ايضا طلحة بن عبد الله بن محمد

بن عبد العزيز بن الناسك المذكور محدث مات سنة تسع و ثلاثين
و ثلثمائة و من ولد عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عمر عبد الرحمن بن
ابي سلمة بن عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عمر تولي شرطة المدينة و
اخوه عبيد الله بن ابي سلمة بن عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عمر ولي
قضاء المدينة لعبد الصمد بن علي - و ابو العباس محمد بن عثمن بن
عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عمر قتله المنصور صبرا - و عثمن بن حمزة بن
عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عمر صلبه عبد الرحمن بن معوية فی المرج
بقرطبة و كان قد ادرك فی الاندلس رناسة و اخوه عمارة كان بالمدينة
من النساك المجتهدين و من ولد زيد بن عبد الله عمر بن ابراهيم بن
واقد بن محمد بن زيد بن عبد الله بن عمر غلب علی اليمن حين
الفتنة بين ابن زبيدة و المامون و ابنه محمد بن محمد بن عمر
ولي ايضا صنعاء - و ابنه احمد بن محمد بن عمر ولي ايضاً فولد عمر
بعض اعمال اليمن - و اخوة جده واقد المذكور عاصم و ابوبكر و عمر
و زيد بنو محمد بن زيد بن عبد الله بن عمر محدثون - و عقب
زيد بن عبد الله بالكوفة و مكة - و منهم ابرهيم بن محمد بن ابرهيم بن
محمد بن ابرهيم بن واقد بن عبد الله بن عمر بن الخطاب محدث
بغدادي و ابوبكر بن عمر بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن عمر محدث
روی عنه البخاري - و من ولد سالم بن عبد الله بن عمر ابوبكر و عمر
و عبد الله بنو سالم - منهم عمر بن سالم بن عمر بن سالم بن عبد الله بن
عمر و منهم يحيی بن عبد الله بن سالم محدث مدني - و منهم قوم
سكنوا بصرة المغرب و قد بادوا و كان رحل منهم الی فاس و اوطنها
ادريس بن عامر بن عبد الله بن محمد بن عبد الله بن عمر بن عبد الله
بن علي بن ابي بكر بن سالم بن عبد الله بن عمر - و اما واقد بن
عبد الله بن عمر فمات في حيوة ابيه و اعقب ابنا اسمه عبد الله -
و عمر بن حمزة بن عبد الله بن عمر - و اما عبيد الله بن عمر بن الخطاب
فلم يبق له عقب الا من قبل ابنه الحر ابن عبيد الله و بقيتهم بحران
و بالاندلس كان منهم الطيب بن عمر بن الطيب بن محمد بن السليل بن

سعيد بن عبد الودود بن البحتري بن عمر بن البحتري بن الحر بن عبيد الله بن عمر كان مدبر مملكة ادريس بن علي بن حمود الحسني بالمغرب - و ولد الطيب هذا عبد الرحمن من اهل الطلب و العناية و قد انقرض ولد الطيب بن محمد بن السليل و كان البحتري بن عمر بن البحتري قد ضرب عنقه صبرا عبد الله بن علي بن عبد الله بن العباس - و ولد عاصم بن عمر بن الخطاب عمر و حفص و عبيد الله و سليمن و حفصة و ام عاصم ولدت امير المومنين عمر بن عبد العزيز قتل عبيد الله و سليمن يوم الحرة و ابوهما حي فتصدق علي بنيهما عبد الله و عاصم ابني عبيد الله و عاصم و عمر ابني سليمن بماله بالاكحل و هو مقدار ما كان يقع لابويهم من ميراثه لو ماتا بعده فاما عاصم بن عبيد الله بن عاصم فضعيف فى الحديث البتة و اما عمر بن سليمن فروى عنه شعبة و ولد حفص بن عاصم بن عمر بن الخطاب عيسي لقبه رباح محدث و عمر فولد عمر بن حفص عبد الله الفقيه الجليل المحدث و عبد الله يضعف فى الحديث و ابوبكر ولي قضاء المدينة و محمد و عبد الرحمن و زيد و عاصم يضعف فى الحديث كلهم نساك جلة يعرفون بالسبلانية لعظم لحاهم امهم كلهم فاطمة بنت عمر بن عاصم بن عمر ابن الخطاب فولد عبد الله بن عمر بن حفص بن عاصم بن عمر عبد الرحمن ولي قضاء المدينة للرشيد و القسم ضعيف روي عنه الحديث امهما حفصة بنت ابي بكر بن محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن عمر بن الخطاب و ولد عبيد الله ابن عمر الثقة رباح ضعف البتة فى الحديث و ولد عبد الرحمن الاصغر بن عمر ابن الخطاب عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن لقبه المحبر و كان معتوها و طلق امراته فاجاز عمه عبد الله بن عمر عليه الطلاق - و من ولده عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن بن المحبر عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عمر بن الخطاب ولي قضاء مصر للرشيد فتظلم منه قوم فقال الرشيد لكتابه انظروا من يتولي اعمالنا كم فيهم من ولد عمر بن الخطاب فقالوا ليس فيهم احد منهم غير هذا فقال الرشيد و الله لا عزلته ابدا فلما مات الرشيد عزله الامين و ولي هاشم ابن

ابي بكر الصديق و كان حنفي المذهب فاساء معاملة العمري و
اصحابه - ابو الهياميم محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن عمر
خرج مع محمد بن عبد الله الحسني - مضي بنو رزاح بن عدي بن
كعب - و هؤلاء ولد عويج بن عدي بن كعب - ولد عويج بن عدي كعب
عبيد بن عويج - فولد عبيد الله و عوف - فمن ولد عبد الله بن عبيد
بن عويج حذيفة و حذافة ابنا غانم بن عامر بن عبد الله بن عبيد
فولد حذافة خارجة بن حذافة الذي قتله الحروري بمصر و هو يظنه
عمرو بن العاص فلما عرف من قتل قال اردت عمرا و اراد الله خارجة
فارسلها مثلا - و قد انقرض ولد حذافة و آخر من بقي منهم قديسة بنت
عون بن خارجة بن حذافة ماتت بمصر - و ولد حذيفة بن غانم ابا الجهم
اسمه عبيد الله استعمله رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم على النفل يوم
حنين و على بعض الصدقات و هو اول من تولى دفن عثمان رضي الله
عنه مع حكيم بن حزام و جبير بن مطعم و مكرم بن سار و عبد الله بن الزبير
و نفر معهم - و ابا حثمة بن حذيفة فولد ابو حثمة سليمن بن ابي حثمة
و امه الشفاء بنت عبد الله التي كان عمر استعملها على السوق و كان
سليمن فاضلا و ابناه عثمان و ابوبكر ابنا سليمن روي عنهما الحديث -
و ولد ابوالجهم بن حذيفة عبد الرحمن و عبد الله الاكبر قتل يوم
اجنادين بالشام - و سليمن و عبد الله الاصغر امهما غسانية اسمها رحاجة
نالها سبباً و هي التي ارادت خولة ام محمد بن ابي الجهم ان يذبحها
لها ابوالجهم و تدهن بمخها اذ ادعت انها سحرتها و كانت خولة عند
ابي جهل قبل ابي الجهم و كانت خولة اعرابية جاهلية جافية مجنونة
ففي هذا وقع القتال بين بني عدي بن كعب بغضب بعضهم لولد
خولة و بغضب بعضهم لولد رحجة - و في هذه الحروب قتل زيد بن
عمر بن الخطاب اتي ليصلح بينهم فاصابته ضربة خاطئة قيل ان خالد بن
اسلم اخا زيد بن اسلم مولى عمر اصابه و زكريا و محمد قتله مسلم بن
عقبة يوم الحرة امه خولة بنت القعقاع ابن معبد بن زرارة التميمي و
حميد امه اميمة بنت الحميد بن جمانة بن قيس بن زهير و صخير و

صخر اعقبوا حاشا حميدا فلا عقب له فمن انسالهم اسمعيل بن محمد بن ابى الجهم كان من الخطباء و ابوبكر بن عبد الله بن ابى الجهم كان من الفقهاء و خلد بن الياس بن صخر بن ابى الجهم من المحدثين و ابنه محمد بن خلد و بكر بن صخير بن ابى الجهم روى عنه الحديث - و حميد بن سليمن بن حفص بن عبد الله بن ابى الجهم المذكور عالم راوية - و ولد عوف بن عبيد بن عويج بن عدي عبد بن عوف و حرثان بن عوف و نضلة بن عوف فمن ولد عبد بن عوف نعيم النحام بن عبد الله بن اسيد بن عبد بن عوف له صحبة و هجرة قتل يوم اجنادين و هو الذي اشترى المدبر باعه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و ابنه ابراهيم بن نعيم و امه زينب بنت حنظلة بن قسامة بن عبيد بن طريف بن ملك بن جدعان بن رومان فطريف هذا هو ممدوح امرى القيس و كانت قبل نعيم عند اسامة بن زيد - فطلقها و عمتها الجرباء بنت قسامة كانت عند طلحة بن عبيد الله و امنة بنت نعيم هي التي خطبها عبد الله ابن عمر فرده نعيم و انكحها النعمن بن عدي بن نضلة بن عبد العزى بن حرثان بن عوف بن عبيد بن عويج بن عدي بن كعب - و عدي بن نضلة والد النعمن المذكور من مهاجرة الحبشة و مات هنالك و ورثه ابناه النعمن و امية - و هو اول من ورث بحكم الاسلام و استعمل عمر بن الخطاب النعمن هذا على ميسان و لم يستعمل من بني عدي غيره ثم عزله لقوله -

فمن مبلغ الحسناء ان حليلها * بميسان يسقى في زجاج و حنتم

الابيات المشهورة وقد انقرض ولد النعمن بن عدي وعمرو بن ابى اثاثة ابن عبد العزى بن حرثان بن عوف بن عبيد بن عويج بن عدي بن كعب من مهاجرة الحبشة و هو اخو عمرو بن العاص لامه و اخوه عروة بن ابي اثاثة من مهاجرة الحبشة ومطيع بن الاسود بن حارثة بن نضلة بن عوف بن عبيد ابن عويج بن عدي بن كعب كان اسمه العاصي فاتي الجمعة فسمع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول أجلسوا فجلس حيث كان و لم يتماد شيئًا فسماه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم مطيعا

واخوه مسعود بن الاسود من شهداء يوم موتة و ابو هما الاسود اول من
لعق في حلف المطيبين و ابن عمهما مسعود بن سويد بن حارثة قتل
ايضا يوم موتة و المطيبون هم بنو عبد مناف و بنو عبد العزى و بنو
زهرة و بنو تميم و بنو الحرث بن فهر و لعقة الدم بنو عبد الدار و بنو
مخزوم و بنو سهم و بنو عدي و بنو جمح و لم يدخل بنو عامر ابن لوي
و لا بنو محارب بن فهر في شيء من ذلك - فولد مطيع عبد الله كان
على المهاجرين يوم الحرة و منازل ولده بردان و قتل مع ابن الزبير بمكة
رضى الله عنهم و كان اسمه العاصي و ذلك كان اسم عبد الله بن عمر
ايضا العاصي و اسم عبدالله بن عمرو بن العاص ايضا العاصي فبدل رسول
الله صلى الله عليه و سلم اسماءهم في يوم واحد و سمي كل امرئ منهم
عبد الله و سليمن و مطيع قتل يوم الجمل و عبد الرحمن بن مطيع و
اسمعيل بن مطيع و فاطمة بنت عبد الله بن مطيع تزوجها الوليد بن
عبدالملك و كان مطلاقا فلما وافت اليه من المدينة بات عندها فلما
اصبح و اراد الخروج اخذت بثوبه و قالت له يا امير المومنين انا عاملنا
الاكرياء على الرجوع فماذا ترى فضحك وامسكها مالم يمسك امراة
غيرها - منهم عمران ابن اسمعيل بن مطيع و عبدالرحمن و عبدالعزيز
ابنا ابراهيم ابن عبد الله بن مطيع خرجوا مع محمد بن عبد الله بن
الحسن و معمر بن عبد الله بن نضلة بن عرف بن عبيد بن عويج له
صحبة هوالذي روى عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لا يحتكر
الاخاطئ و ولد ابن اخيه عبد الله ابن نافع بن عبد الله بن عمرو بن
عبد الله بن نضلة قتل يوم الحرة - مضي بنو عدي بن كعب - و هولاء
بنو هصيص بن كعب - ولد هصيص بن كعب عمرو فولد عمرو جمح و
اسمه تيم و سهم و اسمه زيد امهما الالوف بنت عدي ابن كعب و هولاء
بنو جمح فولد جمح حذافة و سعد فولد حذافة وهب واهيب فولد وهب
خلف وحبيب و وهبان - فولد خلف امية و كان يعرف بالغطريف
قتل يوم بدر و ابي قتله رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يوم احد و
وهب و كلدة و معبد و اسيد و احيحة و عمرو و عامر و صرم و غيرهم

فولد امية علي قتل مع ابيه يوم بدر كافرا و صفوان اسلم يوم الفتح و
كان سيدا ورد نعي عثمن رضي الله عنه مكة حين سوي علی صفوان
واحيحة بن امية و ربيعة بن امية اسلم و له صحبة ثم جلده عمر بن
الخطاب رضي الله عنه فی الخمر و نفاه فلحق بالروم فارتد و مات هناك
نصرانيا نعوذ بالله من الخذلان و مسعود ابن امية و سلمة بن امية فولد
سلمة بن امية معبد بن سلمة امه ام اراكة نكحها سلمة نكاح متعة في
عهد عمر او في عهد ابي بكر فولد له منها معبد و ولد صفوان ابن امية
عبد الله الاكبر و عبد الرحمن الاكبر كانا سيدين. قتل عبد الله منهما مع
ابن الزبير و عثمن و حكيم و صفوان و خالد و عبد الله الاصغر و عبد الرحمن
الاصغر بني صفوان فولد عبد الله بن صفوان صفوان و عمرو و كانا
سيدين - فولد صفوان ابن عبد الله عمرو بن صفوان فولد عمرو
عبد الحكيم كان من فتيان قريش قد اتخذ بيتاً لاخوانه فيه كتب العلوم و
الشطرنجات و النرود و الفوقة و من ولد صفوان بن عبد الله بنوعون
الوهرانيون و من ولد عبد الرحمن بن صفوان ابن امية المحدث
المكي حنظلة بن ابي سفين بن عبد الرحمن بن صفوان بن امية مات
سنة احدى و خمسين و مائة و له اخوان عمرو و عبد الله يكنى ابا سعيد
محدثان و اخ رابع اسمه عبد الرحمن و ولد حكيم بن صفوان يحيى
ولي مكة ليزيد بن معوية و قد انقرض عقبه و لصفوان عقب بوهران
و الاندلس - و محمد بن عثمن بن صفوان محدث - و من ولد ربيعة
بن امية الشوى بن عبد الغفار بن يحيى بن امية بن ربيعة ابن امية
بن خلف كان بمصر و كان لربيعة المذكور ابن اسمه عوف - و من ولد
مسعود بن امية عامر ولد الزبير الكوفه و كان من اشجع الناس و ام
عامر هذا ابنة ابي بن خلف - و من ولده عبد الوهاب ابن
عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن الطويل بن عبد الله بن عامر بن مسعود ولي
قضاء فلسطين و مات بها و ولد ابي بن خلف عبد الله و وهب و عامر
و ابي و خلف و الليث - و من ولده عبد الاعلى بن عبيد الله بن
محمد ابن صفوان بن عبد الله بن عبد الله بن ابي بن خلف ولي

عبيد الله قضاء العراق للمنصور و قضاء المدينة للمهدي مات واستخلف
ابنه عبد الاعلى - و ولي محمد بن صفوان قضاء المدينة لخلد بن
عبد الملك بن الحرث بن الحكم بن العاصي بن امية - و ولد وهب
بن خلف عمير بن وهب و هوالذي حزر اصحاب رسول الله صلى الله
عليه و سلم يوم بدر و قد انقرض عقب وهب ابن خلف و من ولد اسيد
بن خاف كلدة بن اسيد مات كافرا يكنى ابا الاشدين و هو الذي اشترط
تسعة من خزنة جهنم و عبد الرحمن بن وهب بن اسيد بن خلف قتل
يوم الجمل و امه التوءمة بنت امية بن خلف و هي مولاة صالح
المحدث و قد انقرض عقب اسيد بن خلف - و من ولد احيحة
بن خلف ابو ريحانة علي بن اسيد بن احيحة بن خلف كان
مع عبد الملك بن مروان علي ابن الزبير و الشاعر ابو دهبل
وهب بن وهب بن زمعة بن اسيد بن احيحة ابن خلف - و
ولد حبيب بن وهب بن حذافة بن جمح مظعون و معمر فولد مظعون
عثمن و قدامة و عبد الله و السائب مهاجرون بدريون من المهاجرين
الاولين من افاضل الصحابة رضي الله عنهم - و اختهم زينب بنت مظعون
ام حفصة و عبد الله بن عمر فولد عثمن السائب هاجر مع ابيه و
عبد الرحمن و قد انقرض عقب عثمن و السائب ابني مظعون و البقية
من بني مظعون انما هي من ولد عبد الرحمن بن وهب بن عمر بن
عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن مظعون و من ولد عمر و قدامة ابني
موسى بن عمر بن قدامة بن مظعون ثم من ولد قدامة بن عمر
المذكور - و ولد عثمن بن محمد بن قدامة بن موسى المذكور و
ولد معمر بن حبيب بن وهب بن حذافة بن جمح جميل بن معمر
له صحبة و سفين بن معمر من مهاجرة الحبشة و الحرث بن
معمر و قد انقرض عقب جميل و سفين و كان لسفين بنون
و هم الحرث و جنادة و جابر و قد قيل ان سفين هذا من
بني زريق من الانصار تبناه معمر و كلت - حسنة ام شرحبيل بن
حسنة الصاحب مولاة معمر و زوجة سفين بن معتر تزوجها عبد الله بن

عمرو بن المطاع الكندي فولدت له شرحبيل فنسب الى امه و ولد
الحرث بن معمر بدري بدوي لا عقب له و حطاب و حاطب و هما من
مهاجرة الحبشة فولد حطاب محمد بن حطاب و ولد حاطب الحرث هاجر
مع ابيه الى ارض الحبشة و محمد ولد بارض الحبشة و هو اول من
سمي في الاسلام محمدا بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و عبد الله
فولد محمد بن حاطب ابرهيم ولقمن فولد ابرهيم قدامة و عثمن روي
عنهما الحديث امهما عائشة بنت قدامة بن مظعون و ولد لقمن سعيد و
عيسى ولي عيسى مصر للمنصور و ولد سعد اخوه عثمن كان على شرط
عمه عيسى ـ و من ولد وهبان بن وهب بن حذافة بن جمح عبد الله
بن ربيعة بن دراج بن العنبس بن وهبان قتل يوم الجمل و عثمن
ابن ربيعة بن وهبان من مهاجرة الحبشة و لا عقب لوهبان بن وهب
و ولد اهيب بن حذافة بن جمح عمير و عمرو فمن ولد عمرو سابط بن
ابي حميضة ابن عمرو بن اهيب بن حذافة بن جمح ـ فمن ولد سابط
عبد الرحمن روي عنه الحديث و عبد الله و عبيد الله و موسى و
اسحق و الحرث و فراس امهم كلهم تماضر بنت خلف الاعور بن عمرو
بن اهيب بن حذافة بن جمح و من ولد عمير بن اهيب ابوعزة عمير بن
عبد الله بن عمير بن اهيب قتله رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يوم احد
صبرا و كان قد من عليه يوم بدر و اطلقه و لا عقب لابي عزة و ولد
سعيد بن جمح لوذان و ربيعة فولد لوذان معير و وهيب ابني لوذان ـ
فولد وهيب بن لوذان جنادة فولد جنادة محرز و محيريز فولد محيريز
عبد الله المحدث سكن فلسطين و كان يتيما في حجر ابي محذورة
رضي الله عنه فولد معير انيس قتل يوم بدر كافرا و اوس بن معير
و هو ابو محذورة الذي ولاه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم الاذان
بمكة فتوارثه بعده ولده الى انقراض اخرهم في ايام الرشيد و قد
انقرض جميع عقب لوذان بن سعد بن جمح فورث الاذان بمكة عنهم
بنو سلامان بن ربيعة بن سعد بن جمح فهو فيهم الى اليوم و آخر من
بقي من ولد ابي محذورة رضي الله عنه ولد ابرهيم بن عبد العزيز

ابن عبد الملك بن ابي محذورة ويظن اهل الحديث ان اسم ابي محذورة سمرة و ليس كذلك انما سمرة اخ لابي محذورة - وولد ربيعة بن سعد بن جمح سلامان منهم سعيد بن عامر بن حذيم بن سلامان كان ناسكا متبتلا له صحبة ولاه عمر بن الخطاب حمص واخوه جميل بن عامر من ولده نافع بن عمر بن عبد الله بن جميل بن عامر بن حذيم مكي محدث لا عقب له و منهم محمد بن القسم بن عبد الله بن عبد الرزاق بن عمر اخي نافع ابن عمر المذكور و هو راوية الزبير بن بكار - و سعيد بن عبد الله بن جميل بن عامر بن حذيم بن سلامان بن ربيعة بن سعد بن جمح ولي القضاء ببغداد للرشيد - مضى بنو جمح بن عمرو بن هصيص بن كعب - و هولاء بنو سهم ابن عمرو بن هصيص بن كعب - ولد سهم بن عمرو سعد و سعيد فمن ولد سعيد بضم السين و فتح العين هشام و عمرو ابنا العاصي ابن وائل بن هشام بن سعيد بن سهم استشهد هشام يوم اجنادين و لهما صحبة لا عقب لهشام و امه حرملة بنت هشام بن المغيرة المخزومي - و ام عمرو سبية من عنزة اسمها النابغة و اخوته لامه عمرو و عروة ابنا ابي اثاثة العدوى من مهاجرة الحبشة و اريب بنت عفيف بن ابي العاصي بن امية و عقبة بن نافع القرشي الفهري صاحب افريقية فولد عمرو بن العاصي محمد لا عقب له و عبد الله من فضلاء الصحابة لعبد الله عمرو بن العاصي محمد لا عقب له و عبد الله من فضلاء الصحابة لعبد الله بالوهط و مكة عقب كثير يناهزون المائة منهم كان المحدث عمرو و اخواه عمر و شعيب - بنو شعيب بن محمد بن عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاصي و اختهم عائدة امها عمرة بنت عبد الله بن العباس بن عبد المطلب و كان تزوجها لحسين بن عبد الله بن عبيد الله بن العباس و بسببها ردت اموال بني عمرو ابن العاصي بعد ان قبضها بنو العباس و من ولد عمرو بن شعيب كان محمد ابن ابرهيم بن عمر بن صفوان بن شعيب بن عمرو بن شعيب المذكور محدث مات بمصر سنة ثلاث وستين و مائتين و عمير بن رياب بن مهشم بن سعيد بن سهم قتل بعين التمر شهيدا و ولد سعد بن

سهم سعيد و عدي و حذيفة و حذافة فمن ولد سعيد بن سعد بن سهم
ابو وداعة الحرث و ابو عوف ابنا صبيرة بن سعيد بن سعد بن سهم
فولد ابو وداعة المطلب فولد المطلب ابن ابي وداعة عبد الله و كثير
و قيل كبير و محيص و ابرهيم فولد كثير كثير بن كثير الشاعر و هو القائل
ان اهل الخضاب قد تركوني مولعا مغرما باهل الخضاب - و قد روي
عنه الحديث و قد انقرض عقب كثير بن المطلب و من ولده جعفر و
سعيد و كثير بنو كثير بن المطلب و ولد محيص بن المطلب بن ابي وداعة
عبد الرحمن ابن محيص قارئ اهل مكة و ولد عبد الله بن المطلب بن
ابي وداعة اسمعيل فولد اسمعيل جامع و زياد فولد جامع و زياد
فولد جامع اسمعيل بن جامع المغني فولد اسمعيل ابن جامع هشام
بن اسمعيل كان مغنيا ايضا - و من ولد زياد بن اسمعيل قاضي مكة
ايام المطيع و هو ابو عمرو محمد بن عبد الله بن عمرو بن محمد بن
زياد ابن اسمعيل و كان له ابن محدث اسمه علي و ولد ابو عوف
ابن صبيرة عاصم و عامر قتلا يوم بدر كافرين و لا عقب لهما و من ولد
ابرهيم بن المطلب بن ابي وداعة المحدث بمصر الوليد بن المطلب بن
نبيه بن ابرهيم بن المطلب ابن ابي وداعة يروي عن هرون بن سعيد
الايلي وغيره و ما ولد حذافة بن سعد بن سهم فكان لهم عدد و قد
انقرضوا كلهم الا ان يكون بقي من ولد عترس ابن عبد الله بن عمرو بن
المطيب بن سمير بن موهبة بن عبد العزى بن حذافة ابن سعد بن
سهم ان كان بقي و هم باعوا دارالعجلة من المهدي باربعين الف
دينار و اما حذيفة بن سعد بن سهم فمن ولده سيدا بني سهم و هما
نبيه و منبه ابنا الحجاج بن عامر بن حذيفة بن سعد بن سهم من
المطعمين قتلا يوم بدر كافرين و قتل يومئذ العاصي بن منبه وله كان
ذوالفقار سيف رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و امه بنت العاصي بن
وائل و ريطة بنت منبه ابن الحجاج ام عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاصي
بن وائل و قد انقرض ولد الحجاج بن عامر الا ولد ابي سلمة بن
عبد الله بن عفيف بن نبيه بن الحجاج و ابنه ابرهيم بن ابي سلمة

من فقهاء مكة و اخر من بقي محدث عن ملك بن انس فابوحذافة
احمد بن اسمعيل بن محمد بن نبيه بن عبد الرحمن السهمي و لا
اعرف من نسبه اكثر من هذا ـ واما عدي بن سعد بن سهم فولد قيس
سيد قريش في زمانه والحرث وكان من المشتهرين يعرف ابن العبطلة و
عبد قيس وعبد الله كان على بني سهم يوم الفجار فولد قيس ابن عدي
حذافة و الزبعري فولد الزبعري عبد الله الشاعر الذي كان يؤذي
رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ثم اسلم وحسن اسلامه وقد انقرض عقب
الزبعري و ولد حذافة بن قيس بن عدي ابوالاخنس و خنيس من
المهاجرين بدري كان على حفصة ام المؤمنين قبل رسول الله صلى الله
عليه وسلم لا عقب له وعبد الله بن حذافة من مهاجرة الحبشة رسول
رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الى كسرى و هو المامور بالندي ايام
التشريق انها ايام اكل و شرب و لا عقب له و قيس بن حذافة و هو من
مهاجرة الحبشة و قد انقرض جميع عقب قيس بن عدي الا ولد عبد الله
بن محمد بن ذؤيب بن عمامة بن ابي الاخنس بن حذافة بن قيس
بن عدي و ولد عبد قيس بن عدي بن سعد قيسا فولد قيس بن
عبد قيس عطاء بن قيس لا عقب لعبد قيس الا من قبل عطاء بن
قيس هذا وهم بمصر و اما الحرث ابن عدي بن سعد فولد ابا قيس بن
الحرث استشهد يوم اليمامة و سعيد ابن الحرث استشهد يوم اجنادين
بالشام و تميم بن الحارث استشهد ايضا يوم اجنادين وعبد الله
بن الحارث استشهد يوم الطائف و اخوتهم معمر والسائب وبشر و الحرث
بنو الحارث بن عدي بن سعد و اخوهم ايضا الحجاج بن الحرث لهم كلهم
صحبة رضى الله عنهم و قد انقرض عقب الحارث بن عدي بن سعد ابن
سهم ـ مضى بنو سهم بن عمرو بن هصيص بن كعب ـ و انقضى الكلام
في بني كعب بن لؤي و هولاء ولد عامر بن لؤي ـ ولد عامر بن
لؤي حسل و معيص فولد حسل مالك بن حسل فولد مالك نصر
و جذيمة فولد نصر بن مالك عبد ود و عويص درج فولد عبد ود
عبد شمس و ابا قيس فولد عبد شمس بن عبد ود عمرو و قيس

و وقدان فولد عمرو سهل بن عمرو و سهيل بن عمرو سيد بني عامر
اسلم سهيل رحمه الله وحسن اسلامه و السكران بن عمرو مات مهاجرا
بارض الحبشة و كان متزوجا لسودة ام المومنين قبل رسول الله
صلى الله عليه و سلم و سليط بن عمرو و حاطب بن عمرو من المهاجرين
الاولين استشهد سليط يوم اليمامة فولد سليط سليط بن سليط [مات]
مهاجرا ايضا - و ولد سهيل بن عمرو عبد الله بدري و ابو جندل
اسمه العاصي و هو المعذب في الله عز و جل و عتبة بن سهيل و هند
تزوجها عبد الرحمن بن عتاب و امها الحنفاء بنت ابي جهل تزوجها بعد
سهل عتاب بن اسيد و سهلة بنت سهيل تزوجها ابو حذيفة بن عتبة بن
ربيعة انقرض عقب سهيل و ولد قيس بن عبد شمس بن عبد ود زمعة
فولد زمعة سودة ام المومنين وملك بن زمعة مهاجرا الى ارض الحبشة
و عبد ابن زمعة و عبد الرحمن بن زمعة و هو ابن وليدة زمعة الذي
اختصم فيه عبد ابن زمعة و سعد بن ابي وقاص فقضاء رسول الله
صلى الله عليه و سلم ابنا لزمعة و امر سودة بان تحتجب عنه فلم يرها
حتى مات ولعبد الرحمن هذا عقب و هريرة بنت زمعة تزوجها رجل من
عبد القيس اسمه معبد بن وهب شهد بدرا مع النبي صلى الله عليه و
سلم و قاتل يومئذ بسيفين رضي الله عنه و ام سودة الشموس بنت قيس
بن عمرو بن زيد بن لبيد بن خراش من بني النجار فولد هذا عبد الله
له صحبة فولد عبد الله بن زمعة عمرو ابن عبد ولي قضاء المدينة
للوليد بن عتبة بن ابي سفين ايام معوية رحمه الله و ولد وقدان بن
عبد شمس بن عبد ود عمرو و هو السعدي له صحبة و روينا من طريقه
حديثا فيه اربعة من الصحابة رضي الله عنهم في نسق لم يقع هذا الاتفاق
في خبر غيره و هو كما حدثناه احمد بن محمد ابن عبد الله الطلمنكي
قال حدثنا القاضي ابو بكر محمد بن احمد بن يحيى ابن مفرح حدثنا
القاضي محمد بن ايوب الرقي الصموت حدثنا احمد بن عمرو ابن
عبد الخالق البزاز نا ابراهيم بن سعيد الجوهري ثنا سفين بن عيينة من
الزهري عن السائب بن يزيد عن حويطب بن عبد العزى عن ابن

السعدي عن عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه قال قال رسول الله
صلى الله عليه وسلم ما اتاك من هذا المال من غير مسئلة و لا اشراف
نفس فاقبله ـ [1] السائب صاحب و حويطب صاحب و ابن السعدي
صاحب و عمر صاحب رضي الله عنهم و ولي عبد الله هذا ابن السعدي
بعض الصدقات ـ مضى بنو عبد شمس بن عبد ود ـ و هولاء بنو ابي
قيس بن عبد ود ولد ابو قيس بن عبد ود بن نصر بن مالك بن حسل
بن عامر بن لوي عبد الله و عبد العزي و عبد ود فولد عبد ود عمرو بن
عبد ود الفارس المشهور قتل كافرا يوم الخندق لا عقب له و ولد عبد الله
بن ابي قيس شعبة و عمرو و علقمة و خراش و هو المتهم بقتل علقمة
بن المطلب بن عبد مناف ابن قصي و فيه كانت القسامة في الجاهلية
و كان عمرو اجيراً لخراش و قد انقرض ولد خراش و ولد عمرو بن عبد الله
بن ابي قيس حمير بن عمرو فولد حمير عبد و عمرو قتلا يوم الجمل و
ام كلثوم بنت عمرو ولدت سعيد بن العاصي ابن سعيد بن العاصي بن
امية و حمير لقب و كان اسمه عبد الله و كانت امه بنت عتبة بن غزوان
الصاحب المشهور رضي الله عنه و قد انقرض عقب عمرو ابن عبد الله بن
ابي قيس و من ولد علقمة بن عبد الله بن ابي قيس محمد ابن عمرو
بن عطاء بن عباس بن علقمة بن عبد الله بن ابي قيس روي عنه
الحديث و ولد شعبة بن عبد الله بن ابي قيس هشام بن شعبة و هو
ابو ذويب و من ولده المغيرة و الفقيه محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن المغيرة
بن الحرث بن ابي ذيب يكني ابا الحرث ولد سنة احدى و ثمانين
و مات بالكوفة سنة تسع و خمسين و مائة استجلبه المهدي ثم انصرف
فمات بالكوفة و خاله الحرث ابن عبد الرحمن بن الحرث بن ابي ذيب
روي عنه الحديث و ولد عبد العزى ابن ابي قيس بن عبد ود
مخرمة و ابو رهم و حويطب له صحبة و هو الذي افتدت امه يمينه في
قسامة ال المطلب و هو من مسلمة الفتح و هو احد من حضر دفن عثمن
رضي الله عنه و باع من معوية دارا باربعين الف دينار و قال ما اربعون

[1] Cf. Bukhārī Vol. I. p. 374. Krehl's edition.

الف دينار لرجل له خمسة من العيال و مات في اخر زمن معوية و له
عشرون و مائة سنة و من ولده كان محمد بن عبد الكريم ابن محمد بن
عبد الرحمن بن حويطب المذكور محدث فولد مخرمة بن عبد العزى
عبد الله بدري من المهاجرين الاولين و من ولده عبد الجبار بن سعيد
بن سليمن بن نوفل بن مساحق بن عبد الله بن مخرمة بن عبد العزى
ولي قضاء المدينة للمامون وامه من ولد الوليد بن عثمن بن عفان و
وابوه سعيد ولي قضاء المدينة للمهدي و قد انقرض عقب سعيد و ولد
ابو رهم بن عبد العزى ابا سبرة بن ابي رهم بدري و هو اخو ابي سلمة
بن عبد الاسد المخزومي لامه امهما برة بنت عبد المطلب عمة رسول الله
صلى الله عليه و سلم فولد ابو صبرة محمد فولد محمد عبد الله فولد
عبد الله ابوبكر و محمد ولي قضاء المدينة واما ابوبكر فخرج مع محمد
بن عبد الله بن الحسن بالمدينة واتاه باربعة و عشرين الف دينار من
صدقات طيي و اسد فسجنه عيسى بن موسى و قيده و كان منه ايام
قيام السودان بالمدينة اثر محمود في دعاء الناس الى الطاعة ثم رجع
الى السجن و ابي من ان تفك عنه قيوده فعفا عنه المنصور ثم ولاه
قضاء بغداد و هو مذكور بالكذب في الحديث مشهور بذلك نعوذ بالله
من البلاء و سعد بن خولة الصاحب الفاضل المشهور من المهاجرين
هو مولى ابي رهم هذا و سعد هذا من اهل اليمن و من ولد حويطب
بن عبد العزى ابوبكر بن عبد الرحمن بن ابي سفين بن حويطب بن
عبد العزى ولي قضاء المدينة لخلد بن عبد الملك بن الحرث بن
الحكم بن ابي العاصي بن امية ايام هشام بن عبد الملك و ابن ابنه
محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن ابي بكر بن عبد الرحمن بن ابي سفين بن
حويطب بن عبد العزى قتل مع بني امية يوم نهر ابي فطرس و محمد
بن عبد الكريم بن محمد بن عبد الرحمن بن ابي بكر بن عبد الرحمن
بن ابي سفين بن حويطب بن عبد العزى محدث حراني - مضى
بنو نصر بن ملك بن حسل بن عامر - و هولاء [بنو] جذيمة
ابن ملك بن حسل فمن ولده ربيعة و ابو سرح ابنا الحرث بن حبيب

بن جذيمة بن ملك - فمن ولد ربيعة هشام بن عمرو بن ربيعة بن
الحرث و هو الذي قام في نقض الصحيفة و عثمن و ربيعة ابنا اسحق
بن عبد الله ابن ابي خرشة بن عمرو بن ربيعة بن الحرث امهما اميمة
بنت عبد الله ابن مسعود صاحب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و من
ولد ابي سرح ابن الحرث بن حبيب سعد و عبد الله ابنا ابي سرح
فولد عبد الله بن ابي سرح وهب قتل يوم موتة و ولد ربيعة بن ابى
سرح اويس و عبد الله فعبد الله هذا هو الذي كتب لرسول الله
صلى الله عليه و سلم ثم لحق بمكة ثم حسنت حاله و ولى مصر و غزا
افريقية و ابنه عياض بن عبد الله روي عنه الحديث - و من ولده
ابو العيذاق بكسر العين غير منقوطة و بذال منقوطة ابرهيم بن عمرو بن
عمرو بن سواد بن الاسود بن عمرو بن محمد بن عبد الله ابن سعد بن
ابي سرح محدث مات بمصر سنة احدى و تسعين و مائتين - و ولد
اويس بن سعد ا ارمى التي خاصمت سعيد بن زيد بن عمرو بن نفيل و
عمرو بن اويس فولد عمرو بن اويس عبد الله الذي قام بنعي معوية
رحمه الله [في] المدينة و من هذا البيت فرقة دخلت الاندلس في
اول مدة عبد الرحمن بن معوية منهم ولد عبد الله بن عامر بن وهب
فولد عبد الله هذا لؤيا فولد لوي حسنا فولد حسن غالبا و عمارا و زكريا
فولد زكريا حكما و سعيدا فولد حكم محمدا و سيدا فاما حكم فاستوطن
ليلة و عقبه بها كثير - مضى بنو حسل بن عامر بن لوي - و هولاء بنو
معيص بن عامر بن لوى فولد معيص بن عامر بن لوى نزار و عمرو
و عبد و قد قيل ان عصية التي من بني سليم هي عصية بن معيص
فمن نزار بن معيص بسر ابن ابي ارطاة و اسم ابي ارطاة عمير بن
عويمر بن عمران بن الحليس ابن يسار بن نزار بن معيص و هو احد
قواد معوية و اكابر اصحابه و ولد عمرو بن معيص منقذ فولد منقذ
رواحة و الحرث فاما رواحة فكان سيدا يسير بالمرباع في قومه و من
ولده ابو علي بن الحرث بن رحضة بن عامر بن رواحة بن منقذ قتل
يوم اليمامة رحمه الله و ولد الحرث بن منقذ عبد بن الحرث و عبد

مناف بن الحرث سار بالمرباع - فولد عبد مناف عبد سار ايضا بالمرباع
و من ولده ابن العرقة الذي رمي بسعد بن معاذ يوم الخندق و هو
حيان بن ابي قيس بن علقمة بن عبد بن عبد مناف و من ولد
عبد بن الحرث مكرز بن حفص بن الاحنف بن علقمة بن عبد بن
الحرث من سادات قريش و هو الذي اجار ابا جندل بن سهيل فرده
رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم الى ابيه حينئذ و ولد عبد بن معيص
حجر و حجير فولد حجر رواحة فولد رواحة هرم فولد هرم جندب الاصم
فولد جندب الاصم زياد و بشير و زائدة و يزيد فولد يزيد عبد الله قتل
يوم الجمل و من ولد زائدة ابن جندب فاطمة بنت زائدة بن جندب
ام خديجة ام المومنين و ابن ام مكتوم موذن رسول الله صلى الله عليه
و سلم و هو عمرو بن قيس بن زائدة بن الاصم نسب الى امه و هي
ام مكتوم عاتكة بنت عبد الله بن عنكثة بن عامر بن مخزوم بن يقظة
و ابن ام مكتوم هو ابن خال خديجة رضي الله عنها و من ولد زياد
نعيم المعروف بالنويعم الذي يقول فيه عبد الله بن قيس الرقيات -

* الابيات *

لو كان حولي بنو النويعم لم * ينطق رجال اراهم نطقوا

و حداس بن بشير بن الاصم يقال انه شرك في قتل مسيلمة و
على ابن عبيد الله بن الحرث بن رحصة بن عامر بن رواحة بن حجر
بن عبد ابن معيص له صحبة قتل يوم اليمامة - و ولد حجير بن عبد بن
معيص بن عامر ابن لوي ضباب بن حجير فولد ضباب وهبان و وهيب
فمن ولد وهيب بن ضباب عبد الله و عبيد الله الشاعر الملقب بالرقيات
ابنا قيس بن شريح بن مالك بن ربيعة بن وهيب بن ضباب فولد
عبد الله بن قيس سعد و اسامة قتلا يوم الحرة و فيهما يقول عمهما
عبيد الله -

ان المصائب بالمدينة قد * اوجعنني و قرعن مروتيه

و ولد وهبان بن ضباب وهب بن وهبان و عبد بن وهبان فمن ولد
عبد ابن وهبان العلاء بن وهب بن عبيد بن وهبان افتتح همذان و ولاه

عثمن رضي الله عنه الجزيرة و كانت تحته هند بنت عقبة بن ابي معيط اخت عثمن لامه فولدت له محمد و عثمن و عقبه بالجزيرة و من ولد وهب بن وهبان عبد الواحد بن ابي سعد بن قيس بن وهب بن وهبان ولي الرقة و عقبه بها و هو والد رقية التي تشبب بها عبد الله بن قيس الرقيات و من ولد عبد الواحد هذا عثمن بن سفين قتله عبد الله بن علي و هو اول قرشي قتل في تلك الفتنة و روي لصخر بن عمرو بن الحرث بن السرند السلمي في ان عصية التي في بني سليم هي عصية بن معيص بن عامر بن لوي -

قبائل من حيي خفاف واصلنا * اذا ما نسبنا من معيص بن عامر

مضي الكلام في بني عامر بن لوي بن غالب و هذا الكلام في القبائل التي تنسب الى سائر ولد لوي بن غالب و ليس امرها بالمتيقن في هذا النسب لكن قد قيل ذلك فوجب ذكر شئ من اعيانهم و بالله التوفيق لارب غيره - و هولاء ولد اسامة بن لوي و فيهم يقول بعض شعراء قريش -

و سامة منا فاما بنوه * فامرهم عندنا مظلم

فولد اسامة بن لوي الحرث امه هند بنت الادرم بن غالب و غالب بن اسامة امه ناجية بنت حرم بن ربان نسب ولد زوجها اليها فهم بنو ناجية ولا عقب لغالب الذي هو ولد ناجية وانما العقب لاخيه الحرث خلف على ناجية بعد ابيه فنسب ولده اليها فولد الحرث بن اسامة لوي و عبيدة و سعد و ربيعة و عبد البيت فولد عبد البيت ساعدة و الحرث ساعدة عقب باق و من ولد الحرث بن عبد البيت الحليس الشاعر علی واخواه محمد و عبد الله ابنا الجهم بن بدر بن الجهم بن مسعود بن اسيد بن اذينة بن كرار بن كعب ابن جابر بن ملك بن عتيبة بن الحرث بن عبد البيت بن الحرث بن اسامة ابن لوي ولي الجهم بن بدر الشرطة للواثق و ولي يزيد اليمن و طرازها للمامون و ولي الثغر و من بني عبد البيت اصحاب الخريت بن راشد الذين ارتدوا ايام علي رضي الله عنه فحاربهم فقتلهم وسبي نساءهم فابتاعهم مصقلة لشيباني و اعتقهم ثم

هرب الى معوية فامضي على عتقه اياهم - و من بني ربيعة بن الحرث
بن اسامة بن لوي جشم و حمام و مارب بني ربيعة و هم رهط اسلم بن
كرب بن سفين بن سهم و من بني سعد بن الحرث بن سامة نصر بن
سعد بن العلاء بن ملك الموصلي و لهم بقية و من بني عبيدة بن
الحرث بن سامة عباد بن منصور الناجي قاضي البصرة و هو منصور بن
عباد بن سامة بن الحرث بن قطن بن مدلج بن قطن بن احزم بن
ذهل بن عمرو بن ملك بن عبيدة بن الحرث بن سامة بن لوي احزم
هاهنا بحاء غير منقوطة و زاى وهي [في] همدان احرم بحاء غير
منقوطة و راء و في ابني اسد اخرم براء وخاء منقوطة و في خثعم
اجرم بجيم و راء - و محمد ابن عرعرة بن البرند بن النعمن بن عجلان
بن الانفع بن كرمان بن الحرث بن حارثة بن ملك بن سعد بن الحرث
بن سامة بن لوي محدث و ما ولد لوي ابن الحرث فمنهم العقيم بن
زياد بن ذهل بن عوف بن المجزم بن بكر ابن عمرو بن عوف بن عباد
بن لوي بن الحرث قتل يوم الجمل مع عائشة رضى الله عنها و الحرث
بن قطيعة بن عوف بن ذهل بن عوف بن المجزم كان عمرو بن العاصي
علي ابنته اسمها زينب و حمل بن وهب بن الحرث بن المجزم و محمد
بن فراس بن محمد بن عطاء بن شعيب بن خولي بن حديد ابن عوف
بن ذهل بن عوف بن المجزم مولف نسب بني سامة بن لوي و ولد
سامة بعمان لا ينتسبون الى احد الا الى سامة بن لوي الا انهم في
جملة جرم من قضاعة - و هولاء بنو خزيمة بن لوي عبيد[1] و حرب
فولد عبيد مالك و تيم و امهما عائذة بنت الخمس بن قحافة من خثعم
و اليها ينسب بنوها فيقال بنو عائذة منهم معفز بن مرة بن خلد بن عامر
بن قنان بن عمرو بن قيس بن الحرث بن مالك بن عبيد بن خزيمة
بن لوي و هذا حمل راس الحسين بن علي بن ابي طالب رضي الله
عنهم الى الشام و منهم مقاس العائذي الشاعر و اسمه مسهر بن النعمن
بن عمرو بن ربيعة بن تيم بن الحرث بن ملك ابن عبيد بن خزيمة بن

[1] Read عبيد الله cf. Ibn Khallikan, 398. Wustenfeld.

لوي و عدادهم في بني ابي ربيعة بن ذهل بن شيبان بن بكر بن وائل و منهم ابو مسهر علي بن مسهر بن عمير بن عصم بن حضبة بن عبد الله بن مرة بن ربيعة بن حارثة بن سمي بن تيم بن الحرث ابن ملك بن عبيد بن خزيمة بن لوي الفقيه قاضي الموصل راوية هشام بن عروة ثقة - و اخوه عبد الرحمن بن مسهر قاضي جبل ليس بثقة - و اما بنو حرب بن خزيمة فكان منهم عدد كثير في قرية لهم بالشام فلما دخلتها جيوش بني العباس قيل لهم هذه قرية بني حرب فظنوهم بني حرب بن امية فاصطلموهم و لهم بقية من بني عوف بن حرب بن خزيمة هم مع بني معلم بن ذهل بن سفيان و اما بنو سعد بن لوي فهم في بني سفيان و هم بنانة رهط ثابت بن اسلم البناني الفقيه و اما بنو جشم بن لوي و اسمه الحرث فمنهم نصر بن حاجب بن عمرو بن سلمة بن السكز بن الجون بن زينب ابن عبد الله بن عداء بن الحرث بن لوي ترك نصر بن سيار عنده عياله اذ هرب من خراسان و هم في عنزة بن اسد بن ربيعة و اما بنو عوف بن لوي فالمشهور انهم بنو عوف بن سعد بن ذبيان بن بغيض بن ريث بن غطفان بن سعد ابن قيس عيلان و هم رهط الحرث بن ظالم المري الفاتك فذكرهم هناك اولي مضي الكلام في بني لوي بن غالب - و هولاء بنو تيم الادرم بن غالب - ولد تيم الادرم الحرث و ثعلبة و كثير و ابو دهر و دهر و وهب و حراف منهم بفلسطين بنو جعونة بن شيطان بن وهب بن حبيس بن ثعلبة بن تيم الادرم و من بني كثير بن تيم الادرم ابن خطل الذي امر رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بقتله فقتل و هو متعلق باستار الكعبة و هو هلال بن عبد الله بن عبد مناف بن اسعد ابن جابر بن كثير بن تيم الادرم و منهم عبد الله بن شيبم بن عبد العزى بن عبد مناف بن اسعد قتل مع عائشة رضي الله عنها يوم الجمل و عبد الله والد هلال المقتول عند الكعبة اخوه عبد العزى ابنا عبد مناف هما الخطلان و بنو تيم الادرم بادية - مضي الكلام في بني غالب بن فهر بن مالك و هولاء بنو الحرث ابن فهر بن مالك - ولد الحرث بن فهر وديعة و ضبة

و الطرب و ضباب و قيس و بنوه خاصة يسمون الخلج و يقال انهم من بقايا العماليق ادعوا الى الحرث بن فهر و لوديعة بن الحرث بقية منهم شقيق بن عمرو بن فقيم ابن ابن ابي همهمة و اسمه عمرو بن عبد العزى بن عامرة بن عميرة بن وديعة بن الحرث كان سيدا و منهم عمرو بن شقيق بن سلامان بن عبد العزي بن عامرة ابن عميرة و هو القائل -

لا يبعدن ربيعة بن مكدم * وسقى الغوادي قبره بذنوب

و ولد ضبة بن الحرث بن فهر اهيب و هلال و ملك فمن ولد اهيب عبد الله ابو عبيدة بن الجراح بن هلال بن اهيب بن ضبة امير هذه الامة واحد العشرة و قد انقرض عقبه و عقب ابنه و كان لابي عبيدة اخ اسمه يزيد و كانت ام ابي عبيدة رضي الله عنه اميمة بنت غنم بن جابر بن عبد العزى بن عامرة بن عميرة بن وديعة ابن الحرث بن فهر - و عمرو بن الحرث بن زهير بن ابي شداد بن ربيعة بن هلال بن اهيب بن ضبة من مهاجرة الحبشة و قد ذكر في البدريين و ابن عمه عثمن بن عبد بن غنم بن زهير بن ابي شداد من مهاجرة الحبشة - و ولد لابي عبيدة رضي الله عنه يزيد و عمير - و من ولد هلال بن ضبة سهل بن البيضاء و اخوه صفوان و بيضاء امه فنسب اليها و هو سهل بن وهب بن ربيعة ابن عمرو بن عامر بن ربيعة بن هلال بن ضبة بن الحرث بن فهر بدري و هو الذي مشي في نقض الصحيفة التي كتبت على بني هاشم و بني المطلب و امه بيضاء التي ينسب اليها اسمها دعد بنت جحدم بن عمرو بن عائش بن الطرب بن الحرث بن فهر و عياض بن غنم بن زهير بن ابي شداد ابن ربيعة بن هلال بن ملك بن ضبة بن الحرث بن فهر استخلفه ابو عبيدة اذ حضرته المنية و هو اول من جاز الدرب الى الروم ولي الجزيرة لعمر رضي الله عنه و عمه عياض بن زهير بدري من مهاجرة الحبشة و عمرو و وهب ابنا ابي سرح بن ربيعة بن هلال بن مالك بن ضبة بن الحرث بن فهر بدريان - و من ولد ضباب بن الحرث بن فهر بن مالك هند بنت جابر بن وهب بن ضباب بن الحرث بن عمر [فهر؟] امراة ابي عبيدة بن الجراح رضي الله عنه - و من

بني الخلج و هو قيس بن الحرث بن فهر ابرهيم بن علي بن مسلمة بن
عامر بن هرمة بن الهذيل بن الربيع بن عامر بن صبح ابن عدي بن قيس
و هو الخلج بن الحرث بن فهر و هو الشاعر ابن هرمة - و ولد الطرب بن
الحرث عائش و امية فمن ولد عائش بن الطرب عبد الله بن عقبة بن
ابي اياس بن الحرث بن اسد بن حجدم بن عمرو بن عائش بن الطرب
بن الحرث بن فهر ولي مصر لابن الزبير و قتله مروان بن الحكم و من
ولد امية بن الطرب نافع بن عبد قيس بن لقيط بن عامر بن امية بن
طرب بن الحرث بن فهر نخس بزينب بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم
مع هبار بن الاسود و ابنه عقبة بن نافع الذي بني قيروان افريقية في
زمان معوية بن ابي سفيين و اخوه سعد بن عبد قيس من مهاجرة
الحبشة فولد عقبة بن نافع حبيب قاتل عبد العزيز بن موسى بن نصير
با شبيلية - و عبد الرحمن بن ابي عبيدة بن عقبه و نافع بن ابي عبيدة
فولد حبيب عبد الرحمن ولي افريقية و الياس و عبد الوارث و لهم بافريقية
عقب كبير و ولد عبد الرحمن بن ابي عبيدة يوسف ولى الاندلس و له
به عقب و بالاندلس من فهر عدد عظيم - و من ولد نافع بن ابي عبيدة
المحدث بمصر ابو بكر بن الحرث ابن الابيض بن الاسود نافع بن ابي
عبيدة بن عقبة بن نافع المذكور مات سنة اربع و اربعين و ثلثمائة و هو
في قعدد معوية بن يزيد بن معوية و مات ابوه الحرث بن الابيض سنة
ست و سبعين و مائتين - و هو في قعدد عبد الله بن عثمن امير المومنين
رضي الله عنه من ام كلثوم بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم -
مضي بنو الحرث بن فهر - و هولاء بنو محارب بن فهر - ولد محارب بن
فهر شيبان فولد شيبان بن محارب عمرو فولد عمرو وائلة و حبيب و
حجوان و جابر و رداد فمن بني وائلة بن عمرو الضحاك بن قيس ابن
خلد الاكبر بن وهب بن ثعلبة بن وائلة له صحبة و كان مع معوية بصفين
و قتله مروان يوم مرج راهط و اخته فاطمة بنت قيس تزوجها اسامة بن
زيد رضي الله عنه و ابنه عبد الرحمن بن الضحاك ولي المدينة ليزيد
بن عبد الملك و ابن اخي الضحاك سويد بن كلثوم بن قيس ولي

دمشق لابي عبيدة رضي الله عنه و حبيب بن مسلمة بن ملك الاكبر بن وهب بن ثعلبة بن وائلة ابن عمرو بن شيبان بن محارب له صحبة اغزاه عثمن رضي الله عنه اذربيجان و كان مع معوية بصفين و كان شجاعا و فيه يقول حسان رحمه الله

الاتبؤوا بحق الله تعترفوا * بغارة عصب من فوقها عصب
فيهم حبيب شهاب الموت يقدمهم * مشمراً قد بدا في وجهه الغضب

و من ولد حبيب بن عمرو بن شيبان بن محارب بن فهر ضرار بن الخطاب بن مرداس بن كثير بن عمرو آكل السقب سمي بذلك لان بكرا كان لهم سقب يعبدونه من دون الله تعالى فاغار عليهم فاخذه فاكله ابن حبيب ابن عمرو بن شيبان الشاعر الفارس و كان ابوه يسير بالمرباع و كان عمه حفص بن مرداس من اشراف قريش اسلم ضرار و حسن اسلامه - وعبد الله و عبد الرحمن و صالح و قطن بنو نهشل بن عمرو بن عبد الله بن وهب بن سعد بن عمرو آكل السقب بن حبيب بن عمرو بن شيبان قتلوا يوم الحرة و عبد الملك بن قطن بن نهشل شهد يوم الحرة و عاش حتى ولي الاندلس و هو الذي صلبه اصحاب بلج بن بشير القشيري عن يمين الخارج من راس القنطرة بقرطبة في موضع المسجد الخراب هنالك و كان لعبد الملك بن قطن ابن اسمه اميه ساد بالاندلس و ابن آخر اسمه قطن فمن ولده احمد بن معارب بن قطن بن عبد الواحد بن قطن بن عبد الملك بن قطن اندلسي محدث و قد قيل انه من ولد قطن بن عصية بن انيس بن عبد الله بن حجوان بن عمرو بن محارب و هو لاصح و كرز بن جابر بن حسل بن الاحب ابن حبيب بن عمرو بن شيبان له صحبة قتل يوم الفتح مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و من بني حجوان بن عمرو بن شيبان رباح بن المغترف واسم المغترف وهيب بن حجوان بن عمرو بن شيبان و له صحبة و هو الذي غنى غناء النصب اذ سمعه عمر رضي الله عنه و كان منهم بالاندلس ملك بن علي بن مالك بن عبد العزيز بن قطن بن عصية بن انيس بن عبد الله بن حجوان بن عمرو فقيه مالكي و محمد بن طالوت بن احمد

بن هرون بن طالوت بن عبد الملك بن خلد بن ابي حبيب بن قيس
بن عوف ابن اسد بن حذيم بن تيم بن حديب بن عمرو بن شيبان بن
محارب بن فهر القائم علي بني عبيد بجهة الرابلس - انقضي الكلام في
بني محارب بن فهر و به تم الكلام في جميع قريش و ولد النضر بن كنانة
و الحمد لله حق حمده و صلى الله على سيدنا محمد و آله و سلم -
و هولاء سائر بني كنانة ابن خزيمة ولد كنانة بنين كثيرا لم يعقب منهم
احد الا النضر و قد ذكرنا نسب بنيه وعبد مناة و ملك و ملكان و حدان
دارهم بعدن ابين و عمرو بن كنانة و هم قليل و دارهم بفلسطين و هولاء
بنو عبد مناة بن (عبد) كنانة ولد عبد مناة بكر بطن ضخم و مرة بطن ضخم
و كان علي بن مسعود بن مازن بن ذيب الغساني اخا عبد مناة بن
كنانة لامه و هي امراة من بلي فحضن علي ابن اخيه عبد مناة بعد
موته فنسبوا اليه قال امية بن ابي الصلت الثقفي يرثى قتلي بدر

لله در بني على ايم منهم وناكح * و عامر و الحرث فولد بكر

بن عبد مناة ليث بطن و الديل بطن امهما ام خارجة البجلية التي
يضرب بها المثل في سرعة النكاح فيقال اسرع من نكاح ام خارجة و ضمرة
بطن و العريج بطن فولد ليث بن بكر بن عبد مناة عامر و جندع بطن
و سعد فولد عامر بن ليث كعب و شجع بطن و قيس بطن و عتوارة بطن
فمن بني كعب بن عامر بن ليث بن بكر بن عبد مناة بن كنانة بنو
الملوح بن يعمر و هو الشداخ بن عوف بن كعب بن عامر بن ليث منهم
قباث بن اشيم بن عامر بن الملوح كان علي مجنبة ابي عبيدة ابن الجراح
رضى الله عنه يوم اليرموك و بكير بن شداد بن عامر بن الملوح و كان
من اهل الفضل و الغناء في الاسلام و هو الذي رثاه الشماخ اذ يقول

لقد غاب عن خيل بمرقان احمجت * بكير بني الشداخ فارس اطلال

و هو الذي قتل اليهودي اذ سمعه يقول

واشعث غره الاسلام مني   خلوت بعرسه ليل التمام
ابيت علي ترائبها و يضحي   علي جرداء لاحقة الحزام
كان مجامع الربلات منها   فئام يدلفون الى فئام

فاهدر عمر رضي الله عنه دم اليهودي اذ اخبره بكير بما سمعه منه و من
بني الشداخ بلعاء بن قيس بن عبد الله بن الشداخ و كان فارسا شجاعا
شاعرا سيدا ابرص و هو القائل اذ ذكر انه ابرص فقال سيف الله حلاه -
و اخواه جثامة بن قيس و المحجل بن قيس فولد جثامة هذا الصعب
بن جثامة و روابة و محلم بن جثامة الذي قتل عامر بن الاضبط الا
شجعي فدعا عليه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فمات فلفظته الارض
و فيه نزلت ولا تقولوا لمن القي اليكم السلم لست مومنا و الروابة
[و الراوية ؟] المعروف بابن دأب الاخباري و هو عيسى بن زيد بن بكر
بن دأب بن كرز بن الحرث بن عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن ابن الشداخ
و عما ابيه حذافة و سليمن ابنا دأب بن كرز قتلا يوم الحرة و عروة ابن
اذينة الشاعر و اسم اذينة يحيى بن مالك بن الحرث بن عمرو بن
عبد الله ابن رجل بن الشداخ و شبيب بن حرام بن نبهان بن وهب بن
لقيط بن الشداخ من اهل الحديبية و من بني كعب بن عامر بن
ليث بن بكر بن عبد مناة ثميلة ابن عبد الله بن فقيم بن حزن بن
سيار بن عبد الله بن عبد بن كعب بن عامر ابن ليث له صحبة و يزيد
بن عبد الله [بن] قسط بن اسامة بن عمير بن ابي ربيعة بن عامر بن
عوف بن كعب بن عامر بن ليث بعثه عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه
يعلم اهل البادية القرآن و مقيس بن صبابة بن حزن الذي اهدر
رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم دمه يوم الفتح فقتل لعنه الله و هو من
بني كلب بن عوف بن كعب بن عامر بن ليث بن بكر بن عبد مناة
و كان تولي قتله ابن عمه ثميلة بن عبد الله المنسوب آنفا رضي الله عنه
و من بني شجع بن عامر ابن ليث بن بكر بن عبد مناة ابن شعوب
نسب الى امه و هو الاسود بن عبد شمس بن مالك بن جعولة بن
عويرة بن شجع و هو قاتل حنظلة غسيل الملئكة رضي الله عنه يوم احد
و ابنه ابوبكر بن الاسود و هو القائل -

يخبرنا الرسول بان سنحيى * و كيف حياة اصداء و هام

الابيات و منهم ابو واقد الليثي له صحبة و هو الحرث بن عوف بن اسيد بن جابر بن عويرة بن عبد مناف بن شجع و من ولد عتوارة بن عامر بن ليث بن بكر بن عبد مناة طريف و بر و عبد شمس و عبد الرحمن و هو اول من سمي في الجاهلية عبد الرحمن - منهم عبد الله بن شداد ابن اسامة بن عمرو بن عمرو الهادي بن عبد الله بن جابر بن بر بن عتوارة امه سلمي بنت عميس زوج حمزة بن عبد المطلب و انما سمي جده عمرو الهادي لانه كان يوقد ناره للاضياف و لمن ضل و عبد الله بن شداد فقيه راوية و الفقيه محمد بن عمرو بن علقمة بن وقاص بن محصن بن كلدة بن عبد ياليل ابن طريف بن عتوارة - مضي بنو عامر بن ليث بن بكر بن عبد مناة - و هولاء بنو سعد بن ليث ولد سعد بن ليث غيرة بطن و حميس و حدي و عوف منهم ابو الطفيل عامر و اثلة بن عبد الله بن عمير بن جابر بن حميس بن حدي ابن سعد بن ليث - آخر من بقي ممن رأي النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم مات سنة سبع و مائة - و ابنه الطفيل قتل مع ابن الاشعث و اياس و خلد و عاقل و عامر بنو البكير بن عبد ياليل بن ناشب بن غيرة بن سعد بن ليث كلهم بدريون مهاجرون رضي الله عنهم و ابن اخيهم كليب بن قيس بن بكير الجرار الذي قتله ابو لؤلؤة حين قتاله لعمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه وجده و هو يتوضا للصلاة فطعنه بالخنجر الذي طعن به عمر فقتله - و منهم محمد بن اياس بن البكير و ابرهيم بن هرون بن محمد بن موسى بن اياس بن البكير المذكور مدني محدث و منهم عروة بن شييم بن النباع بن عبد ياليل بن ناشب بن غيرة بن سعد احد المعاصرين لعثمن رضي الله عنه و واثلة بن الاسقع بن عبد العزي بن عبد ياليل له صحبة - مضي بنو سعد بن ليث - و هولاء بنو جندع بن ليث - منهم الشاعر امية بن حرثان بن الاسكر بن عبد الله سربال الموت بن زهرة بن زنيبة بن جندع و اخوه أبي بن حرثان و امية هذا هو الذي تفجع علي ابنيه كلاب و ابي اذ هاجر الى البصرة و هو القائل -

* بيت *

لمن شيخان قد نشدا كلابا　　　كتاب الله لو حفظ الكتابا

و امير خراسان نصر بن سيار بن رافع بن حري بن بيعة بن عامر بن عوف ابن جندع و كان له ولد كثير منهم تميم قتل في حرب ابيه و من ولده الليث ابن المظفر بن نصر بن سيار قيل انه اتم كتاب العين على ما كان الخليل رتبه و رافع بن الليث بن نصر بن سيار القائم بسمرقند ايام الرشيد بدعوة بني امية و كان طاهر بن الحسين و عجيف بن عنبسة من قواده ثم استامن الى المامون و اخوه نصر بن الليث ولي الشرطة بسر من راى و كان من قواده اسحق بن ابراهيم و عبيد بن عمير بن قتادة بن سعد بن عامر بن جندع فقيه اهل مكة و ابنه عبد الله بن عبيد بن عمير و بنو الثمة عمير و عمار و اخوهما - مضى بنو ليث بن بكر بن عبد مناة بن كنانة - و هولاء بنو عريج بن بكر بن عبد مناة منهم ابو نوفل بن عمرو بن ابي عقرب بن خويلد بن خالد بن بجير بن عمرو بن حماس بن عريج بن بكر بن عبد مناة بن كنانة فقيه مدني محدث - و هولاء بنو الديل بن بكر بن عبد مناة بن كنانة منهم الاسود رزن بن معمر ابن نفاثة بن عدي بن الديل الذي في سببه كان فتح مكة - و سارية بن زنيم ابن عمرو بن عبد الله بن جابر بن محمية بن عدي بن الديل الذي يذكر قوم ان عمر ناداه و هو بعيد و هذا لا يصح و انس بن ابي اناس بن زنيم شاعر و ابوه ابو اناس بن زنيم الذي يقول في النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم

فما حملت من ناقة فوق كورها　*　أعف واوفي ذمة من محمد

و ابو الاسود ظالم بن عمرو بن سفين بن عمرو بن جندل بن يعمر بن حلس بن نفاثة بن عدي بن الديل تابعي بصري اول من وضع في النحو اخباره مشهورة و ابنه ابو حرب محدث مشهور - و هولاء بنو ضمرة بن بكر بن عبد مناة ولد ضمرة بن بكر بن عبد مناة كعب و جدي و مليل و عوف و جذب و منهم عمارة بن مخشي بن خويلد بن عبد نهم بن يعمر بن عوف بن جدي ابن ضمرة و هو الذي وادع رسول الله

صلى الله عليه و سلم على قومه و عمرو بن اميه بن خويلد بن عبد الله
بن اياس بن عبد بن ناشرة بن كعب بن جدي ابن ضمرة له صحبة و
رواية ۔ و ابنه جعفر بن عمرو بن امية الضمري و الزبرقان بن عبد الله
بن عمرو بن امية و البراص بن قيس بن رافع بن قيس ابن جدي بن
ضمرة و هو الذي يضرب به المثل فيقال فتكة البراص اذ قتل عروة الرحال
بن عتبة بن جعفر بن كلاب ففيه كانت وقعة الفجار ۔ و ولد مليل ابن
ضمرة بن بكر بن عبد مناة بن كنانة بن غفار بطن ضخم و بغيلة منهم الحكم
ابن عمرو بن مخدج بن حديم بن الحرث بن بغيلة بن مليل له صحبة
و رواية ولي خراسان و ابو سريحة حذيفة بن امية بن اسيد بن الاعرس
بن حرم بن غفار له صحبة و رواية و ابوذر الصاحب المشهور و اسمه جندب
بن جنادة ابن سفين بن عبيد بن حرام بن غفار و اخوه انيس له صحبة
لا عقب لابي ذر و ابن عمهم بشر بن سحيم بن حرام بن غفار له صحبة و
رواية و صاحبة كثير الشاعر و هي عزة بنت حميل بن حفص بن اياس بن
عبد العزي بن حاجب ابن غفار و ابن آبى اللحم له صحبة و هو الحويرث
بن عبد الله بن خلف بن ملك بن عبد الله بن حارثة بن غفار قتل يوم
حنين رضي الله عنه و قيل اسمه خلف بن عبد الملك وقيل عبد الله
بن عبد الملك ۔ و ابو نويرة بن شيطان بن عبد الله بن آبي اللحم قتل
يوم اليرموك و خلد بن سيار بن عبد عوف بن معشر بن بدر بن
أحيمس بن غفار سائق بدن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم و ابو رهم كلثوم
بن الحصين بن خلاد بن معيشر بن بدر بن احيس جليل في الصحابة قد
استخلفه النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم على المدينة في بعض خرجاته
و هي غزوة الفتح فتح مكة و قيس بن ابي عرزة اسمه عبد العزى بن
عمير بن وهب الغفاري ۔ مضي بنو بكر بن عبد مناة ۔ و هولاء بنو مرة
ابن عبد مناة بن كنانة ولد مرة بن عبد مناة مدلج بطن و فيهم القيافة
و العيافة و شنوف بطن و شنظير بطن فمن بني مدلج سراقة بن ملك
ابن جعشم بن ملك بن عمرو بن ملك بن تيم بن مدلج الذي اتبع
رسول الله صلي الله عليه و سلم ليرده فظهرت فيه تلك الاية حين صرفه

الله تعالى عنه و معز بن حرملة بن جعشم من سادات اهل مصر و ابو كلثوم بن ملك بن جعشم من اشراف اهل الشام و مجزز المدلجي الذي سر رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بقيافته و هو مجزز بن الاعور ابن جعدة بن معاذ بن عتوارة بن عمرو بن مدلج و ابنه علقمة بن مجزز له صحبة و من ولده عبد الله و عبيد الله ابنا عبد الملك بن عبد الرحمن بن علقمة ابن مجزز مضى بنو مرة بن عبد مناة بن كنانة - و هولاء بنو عامر بن عبد مناة بن كنانة - ولد عامر بن عبد مناة بن كنانة مبدول و قعن و قين و جذيمة و ملكا و منهم اهل العميرضاء الذين اوقع بهم خلد بن الوليد فوداهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و انكر فعل خلد و كان من جملتهم الفتى الذي قتله عبد الله بن ابي حدرد الاسلمي بعد ان خاطب العظينة و الخبر مشهور و كانوا من بني مساحق بن الاقرم بن جذيمة بن عامر - مضى بنو عامر بن عبد مناة بن كنانة - و هولاء بنو الحرث بن عبد مناة بن كنانة و هم بنو الرشد و كانوا يدعون بني غوي فسماهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بني الرشد و هم من بني عوف بن الحرث بن عبد مناة و منهم الشماخ و تيم ابنا عامر ابن عوف بن الحرث بن عبد مناة عقد الشماخ حلف الاحابيش منهم قريش و عقد تيم حلف القارة معهم و الحليس بن علقمة بن عمرو بن الاوقح بن جذيمة ابن عامر رئيس الاحابيش يوم احد - و عمرة بنت علقمة بن الحرث ابن الاسود بن عبد الله بن عامر التي رفعت اللواء يوم احد لكفار قريش و في ذلك يقول حسان بن ثابت رضي الله عنه -

و لولا لواء الحارثية اصبحوا * يباعون فى الاسواق بالثمن الكسر

مضى بنو عبد مناة بن كنانة - و هولاء بنو ملك بن كنانة - منهم قراش بن غنم بن ثعلبة بن ملك بن كنانة بطن ضخم فولد قراش بن غنم علقمة جذل الطعان و الحرث و جذيمة منهم فارس العرب ربيعة بن مكدم بن جدبان بن عامر بن خويلد بن جديمة ابن علقمة بن قراش و منهم كانت ام رومان ام عائشة رضي الله عنها و عبد الله ابن جذل الطعان من فرسان بني كنانة و من بني المطلب بن جدبان ال الابجر

الاطباء الفقهاء بالكوفة ولبني ملك بن كنانة بطون جمة و منهم بنو
مخدج بن عامر بن ثعلبة بن الحرث بن ملك بن كنانة بطن و منهم
نسأة الشهور في الجاهلية قام الاسلام منهم على ابي ثمامة جنادة بن
امية ابن عوف بن قلع بن حذيفة بن عبد بن فقيم بن عدي بن عامر
بن ثعلبة ابن الحرث بن ملك وكل من صارت اليه هذه المرتبة يسمى
القلمس و اول من نسأ الشهور سرير بن ثعلبة بن الحرث بن ملك بن
كنانة ثم ابن اخيه عدي بن عامر بن ثعلبة ثم في ولده و منهم علقمة بن
صفوان بن امية بن محرث بن حمل بن شق بن رقبة بن مخدج بن
عامر بن ثعلبة بن الحرث ابن ملك بن كنانة جد مروان بن الحكم لامه
و ابو قرصافة جندرة بن خيشنة ابن مرة بن والثلة بن الفاكه بن عمرو بن
الحرث بن ملك بن كنانة له صحبة و الرماحس بن عبد العزيز بن
الرماحس بن الرسارس بن السكران بن واقد ابن وهيب بن هاجر بن
عرينة بن والثلة بن الفاكه بن عمرو بن الحرث ابن مالك بن كنانة
ولي شرطة مروان بن محمد ثم دخل الاندلس فولاه عبد الرحمن بن
معوية الجزيرة و شدونة و هي بلاد بني كنانة فتمنع عليه فيها فغزاه فهرب
الى العدوة و مات هنالك - مضى بنو ملك بن كنانة - وهولاء بنو
ملكان بن كنانة - ولد ملكان بن كنانة حرام و ثعلبة و سعد و اسيد و غنم
و ذبيان ولهم بطون جنة منهم الفضل بن عميرة بن راشد بن عبد الله بن
سعيد بن شريك بن عبد الله بن مسلم بن نوفل بن ربيعة بن مالك بن
عتيق بن غنم بن ملكان بن كنانة ولهم عدد كثير و ثروة و وجاهة بمرسية -
مضى بنو كنانة بن خزيمة و دارهم بالاندلس شذونة و الجزيرة -

———